

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXXIII, No. 15
WHOLE No. 827

July 25, 1925

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|---------|
| CHRONICLE | 339-342 |
| TOPICS OF INTEREST | |
| The Bandar Law—Hypothesis, Theory or Fact?—An Evolutionist's Broadside—Evolution from the Benches | 343-349 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 349-351 |
| EDITORIALS | |
| The Middle Road to Dayton—Mr. Bryan Counts Noses—Snarks and Boojums at the Bar —Dressing for Judgment Day—Our New War with England..... | 352-354 |
| DRAMATICS | |
| Our Loyal Audiences—On Wings of Song— Reviews—Books and Authors..... | 355-358 |
| SOCIOLOGY | |
| Electoral Vigilance | 359 |
| EDUCATION | |
| The Ideal System of Moral Training..... | 360-361 |
| NOTE AND COMMENT | 361-362 |

Chronicle

Home News.—While China itself became much calmer, the center of interest in the Chinese situation shifted to Swampscott. As announced in last week's issue of

The Chinese Situation

AMERICA, the President conferred with Secretary Kellogg and Under-Secretary Grew. After the conference, it was announced that this country's policy towards China will follow the terms of the Washington treaties and insist that China protect foreigners and carry out her obligations. At the same time, it was announced from Tokio that this country had signed an agreement with Japan and Great Britain to continue their "united stand" in the situation. Later it was announced from the President's headquarters that the United States had not entered into any understanding with these two countries, and, significantly, it was insisted once more that the Washington treaties would continue to be the rule of our action. It is understood that Great Britain has been opposing our stand on extra-territoriality, that is, the trial of foreigners by non-Chinese courts. On July 16, it was announced that a note had been sent to the nine Powers which signed the Washington Far-East Treaty outlining the views of

this Government. The only hint given as to the content of this note is that the United States has not receded from its former stand, in the face especially of Great Britain, and that it still intends to call a customs conference at which the American proposals may be presented. At the same time, from London, there were signs that one of Great Britain's difficulties would be cleared away by the appointment of a board of investigation into the responsibility for the Shanghai riots. It is commonly said that Great Britain's policy is seriously hampered by her desire to protect certain privileged interests in Southern China and by the general policy of the Washington treaties designed to safeguard the sovereignty of the central Chinese Government.

Two developments considerably modified the previous standing of the disputants in the coal dispute now going on at Atlantic City. The first of these was the apparently

The Coal Situation

concerted action of the newspapers which denounced both sides and accused them of deliberately temporizing either for the purpose of raising coal prices or ultimately bringing on a strike. This had the effect of a considerable acceleration on the part of both miners and operators to reach an agreement. The second development was the conference of Secretary Davis with the President. After this meeting, it was stated that the Government had decided upon the positive steps to be taken in case of a coal strike. While Mr. Davis would not say to what extent the Government would go, he did admit that he, with Secretary Hoover, has worked out a plan which the President believes will be effective if the disputants do not agree by the end of August. Furthermore, it is hinted that the President is exercising his influence on both sides and threatening to bring pressure on the situation if necessary. This is said to be preliminary to the promised action by the President. It is also announced that the Government has no intention of seizing the mines. From Atlantic City it is reported that both miners and operators expect to be called to Swampscott to confer directly with the President. Meanwhile, the Labor Department gave out figures showing that in ten years the price of anthracite coal more than doubled. This is paralleled by a large increase in the cost of mining, labor costs having more than tripled in the same period.

Now that General Lincoln C. Andrews has been in office for some time, it becomes more apparent than ever

that a serious change of plan is to be put into force in the enforcement of the Volstead law.

*Prohibition
Changes*

The reduction of Commissioner Haynes to a subordinate position, the redistricting of enforcement areas, the discharging of many publicity agents, and the cessation of the publicity campaign of posters, press notices and speech-making on the part of government officials, were followed by an announcement on July 15 that all present prohibition agents would be discharged on September 15. The hope is expressed that this means that General Andrews will break the grip which the Anti-Saloon League and various politicians have hitherto held on prohibition enforcement. This is partly borne out by protests from the politicians and the merely half-hearted agreement with the new plan expressed by the League. The general policy of the new regime is said to be to stop liquor smuggling at its sources rather than, as heretofore, to check and punish violations of the law after the liquor has been smuggled in and distributed. This, it is claimed, will be at once more effective and economical and will involve the dropping of thousands of secret agents all over the country.

Austria.—At the June meeting of the League of Nations the question of Austria's exports was brought before the Assembly. The Austrian Minister, Dr. Mataja,

*Industrial
Situation*

called the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the first period of reconstruction work, the financial rebuilding, was successfully completed, and urged that the second should follow immediately if full results were to be realized. The economic reconstruction, the next important step, was shown to be imperative, as the sorry state of industry had brought about a decrease of taxes and an increase of unemployment, thus threatening Austria's financial equilibrium. Two considerations were presented to the League as necessary for furthering the plan. The first was that experts be sent to Austria to study the causes of her difficult situation and the means of settling it. The second was a proposal to electrify the railroads at a credit of twenty-two millions. American bankers offered to make the loan, but the League would not allow Austria to accept it, insisting instead that she use the eighteen millions remaining from the first loan. An Austrian paper comments thus: "They not only hinder us from getting a railway credit, but also curtail the sums needed for the reconstruction program. The Austrian people must fatally believe that this is done to bring home to their consciousness the fact of their being under tutelage. This is unworthy both of Austria and the League." The experts sent to Vienna stated that there existed a tendency among foreign statesmen to attribute Austria's difficulties to internal mismanagement which could only be alleviated by reform. However our Austrian correspondent believes that greater blame lies with Austria's neighbors who have shut their doors to Austrian goods

so that now the industry of the country must go begging for a market. Dr. Zimmerman in a speech before the principal Federation of Industry stated that the rate of unemployment in Austria at the present moment relatively exceeded all other countries, not excepting England. Mr. Urban, president of the Federation said in part: "God knows we are innocent of the sad condition we are in. We have been made artificially by others. . . . We have an industry big enough for twenty millions of people and we are but six million If help is to come at all, then may it not come too late."

France.—M. Caillaux received an enthusiastic commendation of his financial policies in the recent eager purchase of bonds that did not halt even for a holiday.

*Financial
Successes*

More than 400,000,000 francs accrued in the first two days, assuring a surplus of 100,000,000 francs over the July maturities. It is estimated that a final total of 30,000,000,000 francs is not unlikely. The treasury officials are rightfully optimistic and reckon upon a revenue sufficient to meet all maturities, to liquidate a great part of the advancement from the Bank of France, to give a very positive impetus to the reconstruction of currency. Two factors are cited as contributory to this rush for bonds; the guarantee of interest on a gold basis and the popular favor among conservatives because of the Minister's recent break with the Socialists. The Budget was balanced this year for the first time since the Great War. This naturally occasioned many speculations relative to the war-debt. Talkers at large ring the changes on the need of a long moratorium, low interest, and the necessity of new trade facilities. The Volstead Act received honorable mention as the ruination of one of France's greatest export industries.

The relief brought to the treasury, however, did not merit for the Minister of Finance the delights of an undisturbed triumph. While people rushed for his

*Political
Perils*

bonds, he personally was fighting for political life. Within Parliament he weathered a storm in which the Cartel definitely split, a momentous event in French politics. The timely suspension of Parliament for the summer and an unexpected combination from right and center averted collapse. The Socialists deeply cut by the state of the turn-over tax departed breathing irrevocable opposition to M. Caillaux's plans for new taxes. The Right withdrew conscious that a majority had arisen simply because of the national good. There was no feigning of riveted allegiance. The friends in need from the Right and Center had grievances of their own since they emphatically disapproved of all such taxes as permitted the Government to participate in the earnings of private companies, as well as the tax on unproductive capital

which would include books and all works of art. Hence M. Caillaux, who is now a Senator and so protected against political death should the Painlevé government lose national confidence, confronts perils from Right and Left. Concessions are predicted that will ultimately heal the wounds of the Left and recover a more stable majority.

While the situation at the front is actually more critical than at any previous time, the spirit at home is decidedly more encouraging. The appointment of

Military Problems

Marshal Pétain as Chief of Staff was hailed with delight and silenced complaints and disparaging comparisons. The imminent dispatch of the famous Moroccan division which is withdrawing from the Ruhr, together with other experienced colonial divisions, has brought joy to all except the Communists who selected July 14 for a demonstration against the Moroccan war. Morale increased somewhat by the publicity given to the projected air campaign which incidentally includes a new Lafayette Escadrille organized by American fliers. After current exaggerations there was alleviation in the statistics concerning casualties to date. The total was placed as 4,148 of which 707 were killed, 2,775 wounded and 666 missing, most of the latter being accounted dead as the number of prisoners held by the enemy is known to be small.

Abd-el-Krim still enjoys successes in the field. Along the whole battlefield, operations have been most active. The French have been hard pressed and have had inadequate relief. From Taza, formerly the pivotal point of interest, at present comparatively quiet, the bulk of tremendous hostile activity has borne down upon Ain Aicha, a large supply camp near Taounat. After eight days of hard fighting the road to Fez has been cut behind the French forces. About 1,200 Riffians are said to occupy this position. The methods of the Riffians are always the same. The attacks are quick thrusts for the most part in regions where progressive offensive is impossible. The pressure on friendly tribes is constant and relentless. An adoption of the natives' method of warfare has been urged. This would include the destruction of property especially the harvests, confiscation and the taking of hostages as a deterrent to inconstancy and defections among friendly tribes. Strong hopes rest upon the intensive use of aviation. Marshal Pétain made the trip to Ribat by airplane on July 17.

Germany.—Germany's reply to the French note on the security compact was expected in Paris in the early part of the week. Advance reports that have come to London

Security Compact

justify the hope that the continuance of negotiations will be possible, even though the entire text of the note will

not be favorable from the French point of view. It is hoped that an Allied-German security conference can be arranged for the month of August. The objections expected from Germany are that of giving France the right to guarantee arbitration treaties between Germany and France's allies, Poland and Czechoslovakia; the French claim to the right to act individually in enforcing the Versailles treaty, and the provisions of the League covenant regarding the eventuality of war between Poland and Russia. Mr. Chamberlain is hopeful, despite the difficulties in the way, that matters may be so arranged that Germany will sit at the League of Nations session in Geneva next September. France, too, hopes that negotiations may continue on receipt of the German note, though the report that Germany will propose that the evacuation of Cologne be made one of the conditions of the signature of the compact bodes strong opposition from France. However, such opposition will only justify Germany's contention that the Rhine treaty would not be bilateral. The British attitude toward the compact has always been bilateral, and as Mr. Chamberlain has already conceded certain points to France, further reason exists why certain concessions may have to be made to Germany.

Great Britain.—Though agitation against continuance of diplomatic relations with Russia continues in certain quarters there is no real likelihood at the

Soviet Relations

moment of the British Government doing anything to disturb the status quo. Nevertheless it is not averse to the Soviet authorities being kept on the anxious seat. The action of Moscow in the Far East is so absolutely obnoxious to British ideas that the Government is glad to speak in enigmas in the hope that doubt as to what it really has in mind may be some restraint on extremists in the Soviet Government. But though relations are strained extensive orders have been placed by Russian merchants in London for machinery, textiles and other commodities. As the Soviets are asking considerable credit it is yet to be determined whether the British manufacturers will be willing to extend it. But as they look on the Russian commercial representatives as standing for the saner element in Soviet organization there is a general disposition to work with them unless their wilder colleagues make the situation absolutely hopeless. On the other hand the Soviet press in Moscow announces from "an absolutely authentic source" a report of the leasing by England from Esthonia of the islands of Dago and Esel. The lease which would be for a long term would give England the right to organize the island as a naval base, build needed fortifications and collect the income of the islands. The creation of a military and naval base by the English on the islands is regarded in

political circles in Moscow as a move directed exclusively against Soviet Russia.

The mining industry dispute grows daily more critical. In the hope of remedying the situation the Government itself decided to appoint a Board of Inquiry to investigate the entire situation. At the first meeting of the Court in which the miners refused to participate Chairman MacMillan explained that it had no intention of interfering with the dispute but added that it was obviously to the advantage of all parties that facts concerning the industry be ascertained and elucidated. The miners take the ground that the inquiry held last year with Lord Buckmaster as Chairman decided that their real wages were below the pre-war level while the owners' profits were substantially above and they decline to appear before a body which is to consider whether wages can be reduced. A question in the House of Commons shows that the Government is preparing for serious eventualities. Mr. W. C. Bridgeman, speaking as First Lord of the Admiralty, admitted that the naval personnel had been informed how much they would be paid for industrial work connected with the strike.

At the same time he explained that this was not a new order but had been issued in 1919. Asked if fresh instructions were given July 3, he replied: "It is part of our usual duty to look after the interests of the public if there is a strike."

A conference of trades-union executives meeting in London during the week has approved a measure that may have far reaching effects in the event the miners fail to settle their disputes. The executives plan for a great consolidation alliance embracing between four and five millions of workers in the strongest and best organized trades. The question after discussion was referred to the various unions involved for consultation and approval. If the proposal carries, the old triple alliance smashed a few years ago during the coal strike will be revived in a more powerful form. Not all labor leaders support the alliance idea. Some fear its leadership will fall into the hands of extremists and that the general public's resentment will injure labor.

Labor Alliance Proposed The executives plan for a great consolidation alliance embracing between four and five millions of workers in the strongest and best organized trades. The question after discussion was referred to the various unions involved for consultation and approval. If the proposal carries, the old triple alliance smashed a few years ago during the coal strike will be revived in a more powerful form. Not all labor leaders support the alliance idea. Some fear its leadership will fall into the hands of extremists and that the general public's resentment will injure labor.

League of Nations.—An inquiry was sent to Washington by the League of Nations regarding the character of Professor Edward Alsworth Ross of Wisconsin, who charged the Portuguese Government with a forced labor action in the Portuguese African colonies. Washington's reply was that the American Government had no official relations with Professor Ross and could give no information concerning him.

Charge Slavery

Before the temporary slavery commission of the League undertakes the discussion of the charge, notification of it will be sent to Lisbon. As time must be allowed for Lisbon to investigate and reply, it is impossible for the report to come before the commission at its present session, and will not be considered until July, 1926. A telegram was received by the temporary commission on slavery from James Morris, an Englishman, challenging Professor Ross's charges and stating that Mr. Morris was willing to appear before the commission to refute the charges. A reply was sent to Mr. Morris, who is as yet unknown in Geneva, that he would be informed if and when the charges of Professor Ross were placed before the commission.

South Africa.—A bill granting a new constitution to South-West Africa, a former German colony, has been passed by the legislative assembly of the Union of South Africa. The new arrangement calls for an executive committee, a consultative council and a legislative assembly. Premier Hertzog has stated that the executive council, numbering eight members, will consist of four Germans and four Unionists. The official languages of the territory will be Dutch and English, but German will be permitted in the Assembly. This body is not permitted to pass any legislation affecting such internal matters as taxation, the courts, immigration, finances, public utilities such as posts and telegraphs, during the first three years. All of these matters, together with those of policing, education and colonization, will remain under the jurisdiction of the South African Parliament during that period. In addition, the Government of the Union reserves the right to veto the ordinances of the South-West Assembly. General agreement has been given to the bill by all the political leaders. Premier Hertzog declares that the new constitution, though only an expedient adopted in the lack of a better arrangement, will do much for a better understanding between the South-West and the Federal Government. Former Prime-Minister Smuts, while accepting the new proposal, regrets that a greater measure of self-rule has not been granted the German colonists.

New Constitution for Southwest

The trial at Dayton will leave behind it many echoes in the public press. One of these will undoubtedly be the question of the proper interpretation of Scripture and its relation to Science. This will be treated next week by Edwin D. Sanders, S.J., in an article entitled "Science and the Bible."

Two other interesting papers will be presented by Judge William C. Archer and Moorhouse F. X. Millar, S.J., also on questions arising out of the evolution dispute.

Two other interesting papers will be presented by Judge William C. Archer and Moorhouse F. X. Millar, S.J., also on questions arising out of the evolution dispute.

The Bandar Law

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

THE late Daniel Webster, whose "Reply to Hayne" I was forced to read as a schoolboy, and reading, ranked with "Uncle Tom's Cabin," once said that if we find out where we are now, we shall be better able to judge where we shall be presently. Hence, if at any given moment in a discussion on the Tennessee anti-Evolution law, we hope to orientate ourselves, it is altogether necessary to begin by stating what the law is. I may be engaging in my child-like simplicity, and Mr. Darrow thinks that I am, but I judge that one way of discovering the meaning of this law is found in quoting it:

AN ACT prohibiting the teaching of the evolution theory in all the universities, normals, and other public schools of Tennessee, which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the State, and to provide penalties for the violations thereof.

Section 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, that it shall be unlawful for any teacher in any of the universities, normals, or other public schools of the State which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the State, to teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.

Section 2. Be it further enacted, that any teacher found guilty of the violation of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not less than \$100 and not more than \$500 for each offense.

Section 3. Be it further enacted, that this act take effect from and after its passage, the public welfare requiring it.

With the exception of the New York *Evening World*, which hysterically rings the changes on Galileo, Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition, the press of the country seems to consider this law a joke. If it is a joke, it is of the kind sometimes termed "practical" which may end in tragedy.

What was the intention of the legislators who enacted this law? That they apprehended serious danger from the teaching of "the evolution theory" is plain. Probably what they meant to do is best expressed in Mr. Bryan's telegram of July 14 to the New York *Times*: "The people of Tennessee are simply trying to keep atheism and agnosticism out of the public schools." If such was the intention of the legislators, it will be accorded the support of all Americans, irrespective of creed. It is true that an agency of the civil State, in this case, the public schools, may not teach religion, but it is also true that they may not teach a doctrine which attacks or tends to destroy religion. Nor may they propagate doctrines plainly subversive of private or public morality. Polygamy and the varied anti-social doctrines generally comprehended under the head of "Bolshevism" are instances in point.

But, unfortunately, there is a marked discrepancy between what the legislators, as interpreted by Mr. Bryan with, I think, substantial correctness, intended to do, and what they actually did. Intending to exclude atheism and agnosticism from the public schools, the law which they enacted authorizes the courts of the State to establish a school of Biblical Interpretation, and to punish by fine all public-school teachers who refuse to teach according to its decisions. No doubt, there is a "story of the Divine creation of man . . . taught in the Bible," but equally without doubt that story is capable of various interpretations. Who shall decide what interpretation shall avail to relieve from punishment by the State, or rule as to what may be tolerated, or, finally, as to what subjects to fine? Evidently, the courts of the State. If my inference is correct, and I do not see in what respect it is wrong, for the first time in our history, the right to set itself up as an interpreter of Holy Scripture and to force its interpretations under penalty, has been assumed by an American State. I submit that this assumption is prohibited both by the Constitution of the State of Tennessee, which forbids the imposition of religious tests as a qualification for public office, and by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Judge Raulston's ruling in the State court that the law is constitutional because the State has the right and duty of protecting the child, seems to me to beg the question. The State has that right, undoubtedly, but not the right to protect the child by unconstitutional means, and it is precisely the means specified by the law that are in question. If the State may protect the child in the public school by prescribing the teaching of one doctrine said by the legislature to be found in the Bible, it may prescribe a second and a third, and forbid a fourth and a fifth as *contrary* to the Bible. The question is not the protection of the child, for on that all agree. It is on the means which the State may lawfully invoke to protect him.

Now it is no function of the civil power, according to Catholic theologians and to accepted commentators on American constitutional law, to teach religion, or to rule on debated points in religion unless the State is clearly in danger from some doctrine proposed under the guise of religion or morality. Hence the Federal Constitution forbade Congress to impose religious tests as a qualification for public office, and the same prohibition has been in force in the respective States (with a few exceptions) for many years, and is now found in all State Constitutions. But, as it seems to me, the Tennessee law imposes a religious test as a qualification for office, since it, in

effect, debars from the staff of any public school the citizen who does not agree not to "teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine creation of man as taught in the Bible." It is quite true, of course, that he can claim no constitutional right to teach the falsity of any Biblical narrative in the public school. But it is his right to be protected against religious tests; and the Tennessee law practically forces, as a qualification for office, the acceptance of a Divine creation as interpreted by the legislature. Should this law be sustained it is difficult to see what vitality remains in the Federal and State prohibition of religious tests, and, by consequence, what protection is to be found in the constitutional guarantees of religious liberty. When the State may bar a citizen from public office because he is unable to abide by and teach the State's interpretation of Genesis, it may also bar him because he holds other views at variance with the State's concept

of what the Bible teaches or forbids. Thus we should soon see the day in which citizens would be deprived even of natural rights through religious tests imposed by the legislature. When the secular State presumes to dogmatize in religion, we face chaos.

In striving to force its interpretation of the Bible upon the teachers in the public schools, the legislature of Tennessee has, in my judgment, begun a movement which, if not checked, will destroy religious liberty in the United States. Up to the present Judge Raulston's rulings indicate that he has no doubt of the law's constitutionality, but whatever the decision of the jury, it is certain that the case will reach the Federal courts. Resting on the assumption that anyone's guess is as good as my own, I suggest that Mr. Darrow will stress the plea of religious liberty in the Federal courts and that he will be sustained by them in his contention.

Hypothesis, Theory or Fact?

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

THERE is one aspect to the many disputes centering around the trial at Dayton which has been largely overlooked, and yet I dare to say that it is probably the most important of all. There seems to be no doubt that many are looking to Clarence Darrow as the champion of a movement aiming at the weakening and ultimate overthrow of Christianity in this country. It seems equally certain that a large group looks to Mr. Bryan as the champion of a movement that aims at union of the State with a certain set of Churches. These are two movements equally to be deplored by good Americans. The two groups of extremists, typical offshoots of Protestant Christianity, have met before and they will undoubtedly meet again. It happens that this time they have met on the chosen field of Evolution, and so have drawn to themselves the passionate interest of the world. The reason why John T. Scopes is on the front page and Evolution even on the sporting pages, is that every one feels that somehow or other his own fate is involved. And the evolutionary propagandists have welcomed a grand chance to get their arguments before the world.

The one aspect of it all that is in danger of being overlooked in the clash of passions is the calm scientific question: Is Evolution the Truth? Is it a hypothesis, a theory or a fact? The *New York Times*, on July 12, in an editorial used the following words:

Such an opportunity for popularizing, in the best sense, scientific truths can rarely have presented itself. Let it be improved by men ready to give reasons for the faith that is in them. They can explain in a way intelligible to the ordinary mind the process of engrafting the theory of Evolution upon all modern thought. They can show how it is today the presupposition of inquiring minds in all departments of knowledge. It is taken for granted in every laboratory. It is a part of the baggage which every explorer carries with him into unknown lands. It is the indispensable tool of

the modern investigator and the modern philosopher alike. It is the great working hypothesis of science everywhere. Educated men think unconsciously in terms of Evolution. The idea of it and the applications of it are woven into the intellectual life of the whole world today.

That the idea of Evolution has entered largely into modern thought is so true that men are beginning seriously to ask themselves whether any educational system that ignores it can be recognized by the State as of any value. However, if the passage quoted above be analyzed, it will be observed that the word "Evolution" is used in more than one meaning in a very short space. Evolution as a general word meaning "progress" is evidently confused with the organic evolution of species, which is the point at issue.

Analyzed further, it will be seen that the passage presents Evolution (of species apparently) first as a "scientific truth," then as a "faith," then as a "theory," then as a "presupposition," as "taken for granted," as a "tool," and finally as a "working hypothesis." In fact, the passage is a nearly perfect picture of the inside of the mind of the ordinary person when he thinks of Evolution, and for that reason it is chosen as a text for this article. It is a fair question if the writer of that editorial had in his own mind any clear idea whether he himself holds Evolution as something true, a proved fact, or as merely probable, but not yet proved. It remains, of course, true that he may have used the words without any very exact sense of their precise import, and in that case it is still impossible to say what he really meant.

Now what is the difference between hypothesis, theory and fact, and to which of these three classes does Evolution belong? There are at least two sets of men who more than any others must have this distinction clearly in their

minds, and they are lawyers and scientists. Every lawyer knows that the prosecuting attorney will not convict his man on a mere theory of who committed the murder, still less on the hypothesis on which his detectives are working. He must produce facts; and the laws of evidence, and a judge, are there to see that he does produce them. No scientist reading a paper before his peers will dare to label as a fact what is only a theory of his, still less the hypothesis on which he is conducting his investigations. The unfortunate thing is that lately we have had both lawyers and scientists coming before the untutored public and attempting to do this very thing.

We are all being bombarded with pseudo-scientific propaganda these days, and a very good armor with which to meet the arrows of argument is a little knowledge of what I might call the anatomy and the physiology of thought. Take a chemist who is starting out on the qualitative analysis of a certain unknown substance put before him. He wants to know just what is in the tube he holds in his hands. At present he does not know; he is said to be in a state of ignorance. But he has his suspicions. It may be X, a very rare element. Very well, he draws off some of it and he applies to that some other substance which, *if it is X*, will cause it to give off a very easily recognized reaction. He is working on the *hypothesis* that it is X. He acts as if it were X, to see if it really is X. The hypothesis that it is X, is not a fact about this unknown substance, but a means to find out the facts about it, a "tool," a "presupposition." If the expected reaction occurs, and certain other facts are checked up in conformity with this reaction, the chemist can come before us and say with certainty that this really is X. He has passed from ignorance, through probability, to certitude.

But suppose, after applying every known test to this unknown substance, he is still unable to say with certainty just what it is. He certainly has not yet got the truth about it. He may be still in entire ignorance about it. But a certain number of phenomena about it now lead him to think it may turn out to be Y. He puts these all together and is able to present a very creditable *theory* that it is Y. Many things "go to show" that it is Y. Nothing yet "proves" that it is Y. He has not yet crossed the bridge to the truth of the matter. That bridge, when and if he comes to it, will be the evidence. When the evidence leads him to the Truth, then he will be certain. But he cannot hold as certain what is only a theory.

Now so far this chemist has been a very good scientist, because he has observed all the ordinary laws of his own mind. But now he suffers a temptation to stray from the straight and narrow path of scientific method. Most probably he does not even know he is being tempted. But from a variety of personal, religious, social and utilitarian motives he becomes all bound up in a passionate effort to prove to the world that his theory is the truth, that the substance is really Y. Right away he is exposed to still another mental state, that of positive fallacy and error,

for his feelings have now entered into it, and feelings are the chief source of error. From then on his mind will play him the most fantastic tricks, and he will jump from fact to probability and back again, as he thinks, and end by putting before us as facts things which are not facts at all, and all because he has forgotten the primary law of evidence, that no conclusion is stronger than the weakest link in the chain of arguments that lead to the conclusion.

Now, what about Evolution? Once more, is it a mere hypothesis, or a theory, or a fact? Once it was a mere hypothesis, a speculation, but a very promising means to use to lead the world to new discoveries in biology especially. Using Evolution as a clue, very many facts in palaeontology, geology and zoology were found that seemed to point that there was a gradual production of things and beings on the earth in a gradually ascending scale up to man. Using Evolution as a hypothesis, scientists came to erect a very complete theory of Evolution. Has it gone beyond the state of theory? Is there a bridge of evidence from fact to fact—and not from fact to probability merely—that warrants us in saying, for man especially, that organic Evolution is a proved fact? Read the arguments. Almost from the very nature of the case it is not a proved fact—there are not enough phenomena in the case of man, for instance, to warrant any first-class scientist in asserting the Evolution of man as a proved fact. Even Henry Fairfield Osborn, one of the most indefatigable evolutionary propagandists, in his article in the *Times* Sunday feature section, July 12, admits he can show no direct non-human ancestor from which man evolved. All he has is analogy, inference, probability. From a chain like that no bridge of evidence was ever erected. When we are shown life emerging from inert matter, sensation growing out of plant life, intellectual life evolving out of sensation, when these three chasms are bridged, Evolution will be a proved fact. The quarrel that Catholics—and not Catholics alone but all lovers of truth—have with much popular writing on Evolution, is not that it is science, but that it is bad science. It presents as fact what is only speculation.

And as for the conclusions that are drawn from the theory of Evolution, as men draw conclusions from facts, words cannot describe the confusion that exists. If any non-believers fondly hope that Evolution will prove the non-existence of a transcendent and creating God they are doomed to a disappointment. If ever Evolution becomes a proved fact, it will be probably the most shining proof yet found for the existence of a supreme intelligent Being. Catholics at least have no kind of fear of the most untrammelled progress of Science that remains Science and does not wander off its predestined path into the field of philosophy and theology. What they have to fear is the unfaithful science that violates its own laws and presents theories as truths, probabilities as proved facts, guesses as certainties.

An Evolutionist's Broadside

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S.J.

THE New York Times for July 12 carried a long article by Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn on Evolution. No subject is more pertinent at present and no one in America speaks with greater authority than Professor Osborn on his own specialty. Yet with all due deference to his known learning, the article is a typical evolutionist broadside, overwhelming the uninitiated reader with sweeping generalities and with unproved and unprovable statements. It might be well to remark just here that we would readily forgive the writer for not advancing proofs in such a popular article. Therewith we have no quarrel. But statements are made which are not proved anywhere and for which no proof can be advanced.

Writing more as an orator than as an outstanding scientist of international fame, Professor Osborn almost exhausts language with his "overwhelming mass of evidence, anatomical and palaeontological," "in the most irrefutable manner," "indubitable human manufacture," "new evidence for this entire independence," "prove beyond a possibility of a doubt," "now positively known," "is now definitely determined." Yet if we check up such inclusive statements with ascertained facts, it somehow seems to strike us that strong affirmations abound just where facts are scarcest and interpretations and inferences most plentiful. It is precisely such grandiloquent dust-throwing into the eyes of the public, which has no time to check up assertions with facts, that makes temperate writing on evolution so difficult.

In one of these excursions into the realms of imagination, Professor Osborn speaks of "the acceptance of this great truth of human ascent by men of religious and scientific beliefs, in all parts of the world, except those who have fallen under the spell of oratorical and sophistical misrepresentation." Can we thus so readily dismiss all Catholic theologians and the Catholic Church itself which proclaims as a dogma of faith that one man and one woman were the sole progenitors of this human race of ours, and which consequently flatly refuses "acceptance of this great truth of human ascent," at least by the evolution of many male and female animals into many male and female human beings? Are all sound philosophers "under the spell of oratorical and sophistical misrepresentation" when they assert, in contradiction to Professor Osborn and his confreres, that man's soul did not and could not evolve from matter or from animal souls, but is spiritual in being and is individually created by God and placed in the human embryo? Surely the

wisdom of ages and God's revelational truth will not thus be waived aside into the scrap-heap of emotionally instilled error.

But it may be asked: "Does Professor Osborn hold the evolution of the soul?" The answer is that he does, as is indicated in his article (column 2, top) and clearly expressed in his latest book "The Earth Speaks to Bryan," ch. iv, pp. 49, ff. "And do evolutionists deny Adam and Eve?" They do, for as J. Arthur Thomson says frankly (*John O'London's Weekly*, October 27, 1923): "And there never was a first man, any more than a first wheat grain or a first horse." In another moment of fancy-flight Professor Osborn writes: "No existing form of anthropoid ape is even remotely related to the stock which has given rise to man." That is quite careless writing for it is a denial of his whole theory and a flat contradiction of his "family tree." His reiterated assertion is that we and the apes have a common ancestor. Then surely they are at least "remotely related" to us, even as my sixty-fourth cousin is "remotely related" to me and cannot possibly be "totally disconnected" from my family "from its earliest history."

But to come to our second charge that statements are made which have not been proved and cannot be proved, Professor Osborn tells each of us that he is "a syncopated epitome of your entire past history" and that "modern anatomy leaves no shadow, not a possibility of doubt that man has ascended from a lower to a higher state." But to just what does he refer by this "overwhelming mass of evidence?" Is his "syncopated epitome" the same as J. Arthur Thomson's "veritable museum of relics" and thus to be referred to the vestigial or rudimentary organs? If so, then sheer scientific precision ought to give him pause and, to mention only one branch of medicine, endocrinology ought to stare him out of countenance. He has certainly forgotten the words of his "old friend and teacher Huxley," warning all against speculation about useless organs, after the thyroid gland episode.

Or does he mean by "syncopated epitome" to reaffirm "the biogenetic law" whereby embryonic man is supposed to re-live through all the stages of existence wherein his supposed subhuman and animal ancestors lived? If he does refer to the biogenetic law, then not only is there a "possibility of doubt" but there is a thoroughly expressed denial of such a law by scientists themselves and such a revamping of the law by Sir Arthur Keith himself (*Nature*, August 18, 1923, p. 267) that he seems to have done away with it.

But by "syncopated epitome" he may mean the multiple homologies that do actually exist between man and animals, notably the apes. But what of that? Resemblance proves resemblance and not oneness of genetic origin, since it is adequately possible that God might have brought each gradedly progressive species into existence by a fresh creative act. Resemblance proves resemblance—that is all.

Nor does this denial of the value of homologies as proof of evolution destroy the science of comparative anatomy or comparative physiology or comparative psychology, as one may still study and compare and contrast structures and organs and functions, even when not genetically related. If by a fiat of His will God here and now brought a cat and a dog and an ape and a man into existence, one could legitimately carry on one's comparative studies with these four creatures genetically unrelated. Not only is it false that "modern anatomy leaves not a shadow, not a possibility of doubt," but, translate this "syncopated epitome" as we like, the "overwhelming mass of evidence" proves illusory, and counteracting it there stand the hard and reiterated denials of scientists themselves.

When we come to palaeontology we find of course the same familiar names and the same familiar re-counting of fragmentary bones. If Professor Osborn is so certain of "the most irrefutable manner" in which man's evolution is proved by these fragments, why does he write with unaccustomed concessiveness in "The Earth Speaks to Bryan," Ch. 1, pp. 10-11: "Challenge as we may the less perfect fossil discoveries in the Trinil sands, in the Piltdown gravels, in the Heidelberg riverbeds, no man can challenge the convincing testimony to the creative evolution of man afforded by the several complete skeletons of the race of Neanderthal," etc. He would seem to imply a sympathetic feeling for those who do so challenge. Yet in the present article no hesitancy is expressed, no least doubt entertained. Though some scientists call him an ape and others a man and others a missing link and another a microcephalic idiot, *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, the Java man, engenders no least doubt in Professor Osborn's mind. The Piltdown skull and the Piltdown jaw may have belonged, the one to a man and the other to a chimpanzee, as Waterson and Miller say, or they may have both been human but belonging to different individuals, as Hrdlicka says, but Professor Osborn is "absolutely assured" that they belonged to *Eoanthropus Dawsonii* and that he was a missing link.

But it is with the Foxhall man that the writer draws the longest bow. Of this man we have not even a single tooth nor splinter of a single bone, yet we know that he had (1) "a powerful and opposable thumb" and (2) "a brain of considerable size" and (3) "walked upright or nearly so." And whence this knowledge of Sir Foxhall of whom no single bone remains? From "eoliths" or flints with boldly flaked surfaces, some of which are "rostro-carinate" flints so named from their shape. Pro-

fessor Osborn claims they are "of indubitable human manufacture" i. e. "artefacts," yet that is what is precisely disputed and to many learned men they are merely flints with "worn and battered edges which are as characteristic of these flints as they are of many a broken nodule in torrent gravel or seashore shingle." In the last edition of "The Church and Science," p. 212, Sir Bertram Windle says:

"A crushing piece of evidence brought forward by the learned archaeologist, the Abbe Breuil, has, however, convinced many, it might even be said the vast majority of prehistoric archaeologists, that it is unsafe to look upon eoliths as being artefacts." Yet from these flints, which may have been shaped only by nature's agencies, we are asked to construct an upright, large-brained, opposably thumbed man and acknowledge him as a missing-link—and all this is proved "beyond the possibility of doubt."

If all this matter of human evolution is so evidentially certain, how is it that the *Washington Post* for July 4, 1925 quotes Dr. Walker Hough, head curator of the National Museum, as follows:

"There are, unfortunately, for our theory, too many missing links. We are confident we are right but to marshal enough actual facts—known specimens linking man with the dim past—is another matter. . . . But the chain of evidence connecting man with his ancient predecessors is sadly broken. Even the Neanderthal and Heidelberg 'men' do not help mend this chain."

It is good to find Professor Osborn speaking of the diagrams of Haeckel as "myths or gross misrepresentations," but we ask ourselves calmly and deliberately, is it not articles such as the present one, plethoric with glittering generalities and unprovable statements, that anger men so much that we have a Tennessee law as the result? We are definitely opposed to any such law, for it merely makes matters worse and is a dangerous precedent in legislation and peculiarly so in American legislation. But articles like Professor Osborn's and the more brazen pronouncements of many lesser men, who are not as religiously inclined as Professor Osborn, provoke such State interference. Facts are facts and no sane man blinks them and no man, least of all a Catholic, is afraid of them. But a fact is one thing and a bone is one thing, whereas an inference from a bone-fact or an interpretation of a bone-fact is another thing. Let us keep to facts—which Professor Osborn has not done; or when we do propose inferences and interpretations let us be modestly chary of finality—which Professor Osborn has not done.

The history of evolutionary views ought to warn scientists. Once, they affirmed that apes were our ancestors, but these were soon relegated into a siding as our remote cousins. Again, Java and Piltdown men were declared to be our forebears, but scarcely had we rendered ancestral homage than we were told they were only collateral predecessors. That is why men grow angry with such shifting infallibility.

Evolution from the Benches

HONORA MARY DENNY

THE Professor was giving his bi-weekly lecture on Bacteriology to a crowded Summer-quarter class. He was a tall, thin, stooped, mild-mannered, mouse-colored man with nearsighted peering gaze who seemed to be viewing in an abstract, impersonal way an infinitesimally tiny world through a powerful lens.

He dealt with realities only, although microscopic ones. Indeed he regarded himself as singularly fortunate in his choice of subject because it comprised facts alone and left idle theorizings to less exact and less practical branches of knowledge. At any moment with the aid of his microscope by means of a single drop of water on a glass slide he could prove the truth of the assertions he made. So he spoke oracularly, positively, with an invincible assurance and, like Shakespeare, without repetition.

The class that faced him was the usual Summer-quarter type. Less than half consisted of Juniors and Seniors laboring through the warm weather for those magical "credits" which would give them an earlier release into the work-a-day world. The greater number of those on the roll, however, were older men and women back from class-room or office to obtain by vacation labors either a belated "Bachelor's" or a "Masters."

Tensely, silently, unenthusiastically, but with a dull and dogged determination the class took notes. With meticulous attention they recorded the Professor's lightest word. Every dry and dusty fact, clothed in its dull gray cerements of words they made their very own.

Behind the Professor, spread out upon the blackboard, was an outline of "Life." All the lowest and minutest forms of life were shown there classified according to genus and species. This outline, to which the Professor had occasion to refer frequently, was the basis of the Summer's work.

With a final reference to the blackboard behind him the Professor drew his lecture to a close with the following astounding statement, "It is most interesting to trace the course of evolution in these low and simple forms of life. Just as man can be orientated with the next lower form, the ape, so the bacteria can be orientated with this species of the Fungi, namely, the Schizomycetes. Of course this is by no means simple or plain. Doubtless, some came from the Molds and some from the Algae, yet it would appear that the Schizomycetes are the more logical ancestors of the lower forms of animal life which evolved from the bacteria. Yes," he continued with an air of finality, "we may rightly trace our line back to the Fungi and consider the Schizomycetes the progenitors of man."

With neither amusement nor surprise the class gravely recorded this amazing assertion. Unhesitatingly, unquestioningly, they dutifully embodied in their notes—"Schizomycetes, progenitors of man." Indeed, they recorded a

puzzled and mirthful surprise when one of their number, a little teacher, Miss O'Brien on the roll, inquired suddenly, "Who, Dr. Harmon, were the progenitors of the Fungi?"

Dr. Harmon responded with an air of patient tolerance as of one who had suffered much and long at the hands of the Philistines; "As I remarked before, Miss er-er O'Brien, to orientate one with another presents some difficulties. I may say, however, that the present lowest forms of which the Schizomycetes is one, sprung originally from the primordial cell by what successive stages is not known."

"But," persisted Miss O'Brien, "who or what were the progenitors of the primordial cell?"

Professor Harmon gave a dry laugh of mingled amusement and disdain. "As the name indicates, Miss O'Brien, the primordial cell had no progenitor at all since it was first in order."

Miss O'Brien showed neither embarrassment nor chagrin at the titter that ran round the class at her expense, but with unruffled air replied, "Then we have really arrived at the beginning of the series? I always have wanted to reach the beginning of the series and find out what started it. But, Dr. Harmon. I thought 'cell from cell' was axiomatic since Pasteur's time. If there was no other cell with which to orientate the primordial one, what was the cause? Either this wonderful cell must have been self-sufficient and self-sustaining, existing always, or it must have been created by some Superior Power, namely God."

"In our present state of knowledge," replied the Professor, with an air of suppressed irritation, "'cell from cell' is axiomatic, but as we are unable to reproduce conditions as they existed at the beginning of the world's history, so we cannot say with any degree of certainty that such a statement held good then. It seems certain that the primordial cell originated by means of some chemical reaction of which we have not as yet attained the secret. The cause appears wonderful to us because unknown. However, Miss O'Brien, this is all beside the question. You are leaving solid, scientific ground for metaphysical wanderings. We must leave all such theorizings for the theologian."

At this point a dark, saturnine young man of discontented mien joined in the discussion. "But, Professor, aren't you theorizing considerably yourself when you trace back our family tree to the Fungi? Why should it be beside the question and unscientific to ask about the First Cause and to theorize about It, but perfectly proper to theorize about evolution? Why should 'from nothing to Fungi' be forbidden ground and very hard to explain while 'from Fungi to man' is so simple?"

A Junior at this point cried out, "Oh, can the chatter! Who cares where they came from?"

The Professor grasped this interruption, which on another occasion might have proved the Undergrad's un-

doing, with apparent relief. "You perceive, Mr. Schultz," he replied, "that the more practical-minded members of the class chafe at idle speculations. Our subject is too concrete to waste time in irrelevant surmises. If you are unable to comprehend the difference," the Professor spoke with considerable heat for so mild a man, "between legitimate scientific conclusions from biological data and unscientific acceptations of supernatural interventions to explain phenomena, I am afraid I cannot aid you. I would suggest that you both read Bergson's 'Creative Evolution.' It might assist in dispelling the fog. I would say, in passing, that the first step is not so difficult of comprehension to the trained mind. The 'Cosmic Urge' was probably a physico-chemical force activating matter. Anyone, myself for instance, who could harness it would be able, by a mere touch of the finger, to do greater creative work than has as yet been done. The class is dismissed for laboratory work."

Presently Schultz sauntered over to where Miss O'Brien was busily engaged in getting a focus on a "bug" and inquired, "Got him yet? No? Well, come on over to my 'scope and take a slant at Grandpa. See his 'hick' whiskers?" he continued, as she peered into the instrument.

"Oh, most ignorant and ill-advised youth," responded Miss O'Brien, "the fog in which you are wandering has certainly dimmed your vision. This is not your Great-great-great-to-the-nth-power-removed Grandfather Schizomycetes at all, but only your Great-great-great-most-powerfully-great Grandfather Bacteriaceae. And, by the way," she continued, "those adornments are not whiskers at all but rudimentary limbs. Two went to form the arms and two the legs of some remote ancestor. The rest became useless appendages and were undoubtedly, after eons and eons of time, absorbed."

Schultz gave an appreciative grin at these sage remarks and then burst forth indignantly—"The old fraud. You know he had me buffaloed this long time. He's been a dusty, dry old chap, but I thought he handed out facts to us. He's been so dry that he's given me mental asthma and hayfever but I've forgiven him because I thought he told the truth. Now he comes along and springs this buncombe on us and does it, just like a practical joker, as though it were the truth. He acted as though he believed it himself and could prove it like a problem in algebra or a proposition in geometry. You don't suppose he really believes, that given time enough, that little bug would grow up into me?"

"Oh, yes, indeed," she answered with a shrug, "wise fools still say in their hearts that there is no God. Of course, you understand, this primordial cell was helped along a bit at first (into existence for instance) by a most inefficient and bungling force which they call the 'Cosmic Urge.' Bergson explains it as though it were a force that doesn't know where it is going but is on its way. It really is pathetic to think of this 'Cosmic Urge' blunder-

ing along for so many ages all by itself when it could have been so wisely directed by a wee little evolution of its own called Homo Sapiens. Just think what might have happened at the beginning of things if Dr. Harmon could have been there to help things along by a mere touch of his finger."

"I'll tell a pop-eyed world he would have caused a stir," cried Schultz. "You should have seen what he did with a mere touch of his foot in his little old Ford coupe yesterday. Why, over on Thirty-fifth he jammed a big touring car and tied up traffic so tight that it took a wrecking car and two profane traffic cops to straighten out things. I'm no church member but I thank an All-Wise Heavenly Father for having kept him from mussing up me and my family tree."

COMMUNICATIONS

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department.

The Taking Up of Church Collections

To the Editor of AMERICA:

A thought for A. C. P. It is to the credit of most parish priests that the getting of money from their parishioners is to them distasteful. Any intimate contact will establish that fact. A. C. P. is no exception. But, from the layman's standpoint, which is more expensive and more obnoxious, to participate in card parties, bazaars, and devious devices that entail not only more money, but a bit of annoyance, or to drop a dollar a Sunday into the collection basket and know that it all goes to the parish?

A dollar is not a great sum today. A parish with 800 families receiving one dollar a week from each has a steady income and is not forced, in matters of debt and building, to resort to forced collections. Forced methods and trick stunts scandalize many, but if a man thinks his parish institutions are worth one dollar a Sunday to himself and the community there is pleasure and freedom in giving a dollar. How many dollars we fritter elsewhere! The American Church is still building. The heart follows the hand. The parish is the fundamental unit of the Church. Let us invest in it.

San Francisco.

F. GORDON O'NEILL.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

That was a long cry from California, and I hope it will be heard in every Catholic community from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I refer to the parish priest (A. C. P.), who considers it "not a very bad idea . . . during a retreat, for one or two talks a day from intelligent, honest laymen, who would tell just what they think about you." Is there any doubt but that religion would be the gainer thereby? Would not new activities be set in motion that would lift spiritual and intellectual standards to higher levels?

I think intelligent laymen would give but slight attention to the "envelope system" or the "dollar-a-Sunday plan." These are necessary evils, that will be remedied in time. Intelligent laymen would like to see the parishioners brought together more intimately, and they would like to suggest some measures that would be helpful in a spiritual way, and in a material way also. They would not commend some pious puerilities that prevail, but would recommend pious virilities that lift red-blooded men to the level of the Crusaders.

I have sat in a pew Sunday after Sunday for more than half a century, and hundreds of times I have wondered if occasionally a voice from the pews might not be heard. Christ said to His Apostles: "Go teach all nations," and with the most indulgent disposition to accept from the pulpit every utterance as almost infallible, I would not describe much that I listened to as teaching.

Are there any priests who will second the proposal from California? I am inclined to say that the number will not be large, but I do not presume to set up my experience as the opinion of the majority of the laity, but by all means let the experiment be tried. It cannot do harm, and will do some good. I believe it will do good.

Brooklyn.

M. J. O'CONNELL.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The correspondent, in your issue of July 4, signing himself "A. C. P., a Parish Priest of California," wants to know what Catholic laymen think of some new methods of Church support and mentions the "Dollar a Sunday Plan."

The Dollar-a-Sunday Club is just what the name implies. You belong when you drop a dollar each Sunday in the contribution box at Mass, in your parish or elsewhere. It is very simple. It is a lay organization for the general support of the Church. It is growing rapidly, and extends from Montreal to Mexico; from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon. You belong if you give fifty cents or twenty-five cents each Sunday, if you cannot afford one dollar. It's a joy giver. Feel the pleasant sensation for a few Sundays, and then try to put your hand in your pocket and push aside the dollar to find a nickel or a dime to put on the plate. You can't do it. You have found more joy for one dollar than you ever knew a dollar could purchase. It interferes with no other church revenue. It pays old debts and builds new schools and supports them. It is good for church, and pastor, and people. It is the real and only answer for dignified church support. It is a voluntary offering and soon becomes a good habit.

Washington.

F. M. S.

Bernard Dornin, Pioneer Catholic Publisher

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have received the following interesting note from Dr. J. N. Barney, Health Officer of the City of Fredericksburg, Virginia:

Rev. H. C. Fischer, of Columbus, Ohio, has given me your name in regard to some family information I am seeking. My great-grandfather, Thomas Bernard Dornin, was the first publisher of exclusive Catholic books in the United States. He lived in New York and Philadelphia, and died at "the home of his daughter" in Ohio, in 1836. Have you any information concerning these facts, or can you indicate some one who has. We do not even know the name of the daughter, nor when he was in Ohio. Any items will be valued, for, with the passing of all his grandchildren, it is becoming very difficult to verify facts.

I regret I can not give Dr. Barney anything very definite in this respect concerning his distinguished ancestor. The generally accepted memoir of Bernard Dornin is that given by Finotti in his "Bibliographia Catholica Americana" (New York, 1872). This is what he says:

This seems to me the best fitting place to give some account of Bernard Dornin, to whom the place of honor will most assuredly be given amongst the earliest Catholic publishers in this country—Mathew Carey has done a great deal, but Mr. Carey devoted his energy and his talents and his money to every kind of publication. Mr. Dornin was the first *exclusively* Catholic publisher. For the following, alas! very scanty, information I am indebted to Commodore Thomas Aloysius Dornin, U. S. N., of Baltimore.

" . . . My limited knowledge of my deceased father's career may be attributed to my having entered very early in

my life into the navy as a midshipman and, in fact, fresh from school, and having been kept very actively employed abroad . . . I was thus cut off from much family chat and history."

Then he informed me that Mr. Bernard Dornin removed to this country from Dublin in 1803. He left Ireland in consequence of his political opinions. He enjoyed the warm friendship of Emmets, Dr. Macneven, Counsellor Samson.

Soon after settling in New York, he set up an establishment at Newburg, N. Y., and another at Edenton, N. C., bookselling and stationery. Mr. Dornin enjoyed the warm friendship of Archbishop Carroll and of his successors, including Dr. Kenrick. He was esteemed an excellent writer, highly educated, gifted with a fine memory, which happily told in literary and social circles. At last he withdrew from business and went to Ohio to reside near his daughters and died in 1836, aged 75 years.

In a sort of colophon to his book Father Finotti adds to this—he was writing in 1872 when the Catholic population had increased to more than five millions:

" . . . The Catholic literature in the United States previous to 1820, scanty as it may appear, must be allowed to have been in advance of the money-making, sickly, riding-on-both-sides-of-the-fence efforts of more recent dates. Mathew Carey was wrong in publishing all kinds of works—albeit, there are allowances to be made in his favor, and it would be unjust to look upon him as the prototype of wishy-washy modern Catholic publishers or booksellers. Bernard Dornin was the prototype of the true and honest Catholic publisher. Had Dornin lived *hicce temporibus*, he'd die of starvation—he was too honest.

There are some seventy books of those pioneer days that carry Bernard Dornin's imprint as publisher. They indicate that he was in New York (136 Pearl Street), in 1805, 1807 and 1808; in Baltimore (29 Saratoga Street; 30 Baltimore Street and 94 Market Street), in 1806, 1809-17; and in Philadelphia (Third and Fourth and Walnut Streets), 1818-1823. They were mainly books of devotion and controversial works and, no doubt, were most useful in those strenuous days.

The New York list begins with a New Testament which was printed for him in Brooklyn "by T. Kirk for Campbell and Mitchell . . . D. Smith and B. Dornin, Booksellers." This was followed in 1807 by Pastorini's "The General History of the Christian Church" which has a special value in the eight pages of Subscribers' names at the end that now constitute a Catholic Who's Who of that era. Other New York issues were Catechisms, Fletcher's "Reflections on the Spirit of Religious Controversy"; a Bossuet Sermon; Irish history by Dr. Macneven; an edition of the Imitation; "Practical Reflections for Every Day in the Year" (1808), edited by Father Neale, S.J.; and also in 1808, an edition of "The Pious Guide," prepared in 1792 by the Jesuit Fathers of Georgetown College. It was a book of 280 pages, over fifty of which were given to "Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus." Its price was 87½ cents.

As New York Catholic literature and Barclay Street are supposed to be synonymous it is of interest to give the title here of the first bubble known to have gushed up from that local branch of the Pierean Spring:

Catholic Doctrine and Principles explained; with a brief account of the *Conversion of the Duchess of York* (one of the Royal Family of England), as written by herself. Also a Sketch from the Life and an Account of the Conversion of Sir Michael Ramsay to the Catholic Church by Archbishop Fénelon, as given by Ramsay himself. *Highly Interesting.* New York: William Higgins, No. 16 Barclay Street, 1817.

It was printed in Brooklyn by the famous Alden Spooner, the owner and editor of the Whig *Long Island Star*, the local village organ of that day and was a 24 mo of ninety-two pages.

There are forty-three titles in the Baltimore list, which ranges from an "Ordo" and several Catechisms through various useful and interesting volumes, such as, St. Francis de Sales' "Introduction to a Devout Life" (1806); Mumford's "The Catholic Scrip-

turist" (1809); Butler's "Lives of the Saints" (1801, first American edition); Milner's "Letters to a Prebendary" (1810); and Challoner's "The Catholic Christian" (1809).

In Philadelphia's list of fourteen titles there are a number of pamphlets dealing with the historic Hogan scandal and schism all controverting the schismatics. The more important issues were, Hornyhold's "Real Principles of Catholics" (1819); "The Imitation of the Blessed Virgin" (from the French); and Milner's "End of Religious Controversy" (1820).

These books indicate the serious character of the reading of the times and the enterprise of Dornin in publishing such a varied and valuable series for the use of so limited a section of the book-buying public.

In 1910, the late Pay Director John Furey, U. S. N., compiled with much effort for the *Records* of the United States Catholic Historical Society a list of the Catholic officers who had served in the United States Navy. He had some correspondence with a daughter of Commodore Thomas A. Dornin in which she told him that she was not a Catholic; had never been one, and that her father had not practised his Faith. Of her famous grandfather she knew nothing and had no interest in his record as the pioneer Catholic publisher. Mr. Furey left the Commodore's name out of his list, but when the "Catholic Encyclopedia" came to be compiled, he was given the benefit of the doubt and a brief mention with his distinguished father.

It was another case of the "mixed marriage" results that are to be found in the stories of the Carrolls, the Barrys, the Moylans, the Meades, the Lynchs, the Careys and other "prominents" of the pioneer (and our own) days.

Brooklyn.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

In Praise of Catholic China

To the Editor of AMERICA:

To one whose lot it was to live in North China for over four years; most of the time in Tientsin; some two and a half hours by rail from Peking, Mr. Timothy A. McNerny's "Three Catholic Celestials in Boston" was an encouragement.

Mr. McNerny was writing of Cantonese immigrants here in the United States. His admiration and enthusiasm would be all the greater if he could witness the Chinese Catholics of Peking at Divine worship.

When I arrived in China I was still an Episcopalian, though for six years I had been pondering the claims of Mother Church to my allegiance. One Sunday (it happened to be the Feast of the Transfiguration) I got away to Peking, and assisted at High Mass in Saint Saviour's Cathedral. Of the seven hundred odd lay-people there I was the only non-Chinese. The Marist Brothers filled one transept, the "Blue Sisters" of Saint Vincent de Paul filled the other. In the tribune, encircling the altar, were the Lazarist Fathers and the Chinese Seminarists; upon his throne was the Bishop of Peking, Mgr. Jarlin. The three ministers were Chinese. The Chinese faithful filled the nave; the men in the place of honor on the left, the women on the right. The Proper of the Mass was sung, by a choir of nearly one hundred boys and men from the Minor Seminary, to the appointed plain chant melodies. The ordinary (*Cum Iubilo* on this occasion) was sung by the whole body of the faithful, who had no books, in a manner that I have never seen equaled anywhere. It was more than an inspiration. It was a revelation.

That Sunday morning God gave me the Faith. Before, I was uncertain; then I *knew*. So the people of the East taught me where to find the Truth.

When I came later to visit the graves of those first missionaries, Fathers Ricci, Verbiest and Schall, when I saw cut into the walls all around the church at Chala (the Lazarist Novitiate and Seminary near Peking) the names of hundreds of Chinese martyrs;

my wonder grew that the Catholic story of China, now over three hundred years old, was not better known among us here in America.

I do not mean to imply that there is not still an immense labor to be done in China. We have only some four million Catholics out of a population of over four hundred millions. However, now that we in America are alive to our responsibility in China, let us not forget the great work that the French have done there in the past, and are still doing there now.

They are handing the torch to us now, let us keep it burning ever brighter. No race of men on earth will make better Catholics than the Chinese. Loyal and true-hearted, they will remain firmly anchored to Peter the Rock once they know of his existence.

New York.

HERBERT W. VAN COUENHOVEN.

Miserable Condition of the Catholic Clergy in Yugoslavia

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The well-being of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia depends upon a Concordat, which has not been made as yet. Few of the requirements of Yugoslavia are directly opposed to the principles of the Catholic Church.

In some dioceses, especially in the Croatian littoral regions from Fiume down to Dalmatia, and also in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Bishops are beggars. They ask alms from their priests, who were sent to work as missionaries among the Croatian emigrants in the United States.

The Bishops and priests receive salaries from the State treasury in monthly instalments of from 350 to 400 dinars. From this meager salary the State deduces 600 dinars for taxes yearly and a pair of shoes costs 1000 dinars; a pound of beef 60 dinars, or about one dollar in our money. He has further to bear the expenses for furniture, fuel and light, etc.

The parish priest acts as a State official in many cases and for such functions he receives no remuneration. He keeps exact records of all vital statistics, submitting duplicates to the State and the military authorities. Even the graves of soldiers fall under his care. It is his duty to watch that they are numbered and kept in order.

The State officials and ministers are as a rule of the Serbian Orthodox denomination and their opposition to the Catholic Church is almost fanaticism. The edifices of the Catholic worship ought to be kept up by the State, but the State allows them to remain dilapidated. The church bells, the metal pipes of organs, candle sticks, all were confiscated by the former monarchy. The present monarchy keeps an eye on the Orthodox Church, knowing that it is favorable to caesaropapism. Altars in Catholic churches are covered with shabby linen cloths woven by the toil worn hand of the peasant woman. The priests serve at the altar in poor, worn out vestments, a disgrace to the sanctity and dignity of the altar.

The faithful are overburdened with taxes for the upkeep of a strong army, and to fill the pockets of unscrupulous State officials and ministers.

The Catholic Bishops have often asked for sufficient salaries so as to enable their priests to live decently, but to no purpose. The priests of the Greek Oriental Church, however, or as they prefer to be called of the Serbian Orthodox Church, receive higher salaries and "bonus" from the government, while the churches are repaired according to their wishes.

This picture of the misery of the Catholic clergy in Yugoslavia is founded upon facts contained in private letters from abroad from well known and well deserving priests. Let our American public judge of the righteousness of the Belgrade Government, and pronounce their verdict.

Kansas City, Kansas

A. STIMAC.

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1925

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

President, WILFRID PARSONS; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, GERALD C. TREACY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:

Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Middle Road to Dayton

THE old idea that there are only two sides to every question was never more completely exploded than in the Dayton Trial. In this case, as in several recent cases where the same forces clashed, the interested bystander has a perfect right to exclaim: "You're both wrong!" It is undoubtedly for this reason that Catholics, except for one or two individuals in their private capacity, have not interfered in the dispute. There is too much to disagree with on each side for anyone who loves Truth for its own sake to take sides with either, and this is complicated by the fact that each in its way is also fighting for a principle that all good Christian citizens cherish. But surely no Catholic will ally himself irrevocably either with a group that is only too patently irreligious, or yet with those who form part of a long-existing movement to establish a Fundamentalist religion in this country.

There is nothing new about the situation. The Church has always been there when it found itself face to face with two sets of extremists. The only drawback in the matter is that unthinking people get the idea that those who adopt such a neutral attitude have no definite policy of their own. But it would be unfair to make that charge against Catholics in the present instance, and this number of AMERICA may be taken as a good proof of that statement. Catholics are for Religion, for Science and for Freedom all at once. If anyone thinks he can defend those three causes by allying himself with either of the two sides in the Scopes case, let him try it. The middle road, it is true, is not always an easy course to hold, especially in the face of our national tendency to take sides in a fight, but it is certain that Religion will be defended, Science advanced, and Freedom safeguarded, only by those who persist in calmly scanning all proofs put before

them and in keeping passion out of it. It is probable that the followers of Science will rue the day when they allowed its name to be put forward as one of the protagonists in this case.

Mr. Bryan Counts Noses

AS has been observed in these pages, Mr. Bryan seems obsessed with the idea that the American Government is or ought to be a Government in which every issue is decided by counting noses. True, this obsession is not confined to Mr. Bryan, but he is at present an outstanding example. "The evolutionists, if they were in the majority in Tennessee," he recently remarked, "could elect a legislature on this issue and repeal the law; but knowing they are in a minority, they have not suggested any such action." "This," comments the New York Sun, "is all Mr. Bryan sees in the question," and were a legislature to ban some particular religious denomination, "Mr. Bryan's only comment, presumably, would be blandly to advise the sect barred to go get a majority."

In a communication to the New York Times, Mr. Bryan proposes another aspect of his now familiar doctrine that the schools should, of right, be completely controlled by the majority, and for it claims the sanction of the Supreme Court. "The people of Tennessee," he wrote, "are striving to keep atheism and agnosticism out of the schools, and in this they are sustained by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Oregon case." This extraordinary contention allows the suspicion that Mr. Bryan has not studied the decision to which he appeals. For in that case the Supreme Court unanimously denied the right of a majority to impose its will on a minority.

The point at issue in this case was the right of the State of Oregon to compel parents to send their children to the public school. That supposed right had been asserted by a majority in Oregon. It was argued by opponents of the law that the child was not the creature of the State to be trained according to the dictate of a majority, and that to the parent, not to the State, belonged the right to select the school for him. These contentions, assailed by a majority in Oregon, were affirmed without a dissenting vote by the Supreme Court. "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all Governments in this Union repose," said the Court, "excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to receive instruction from public teachers only." In other words, the majority in Oregon which asserted this power for the State, was wrong.

In the Oregon case, the Court adopted "the doctrine of Meyer v. Nebraska" affirmed on June 4, 1923. In that ruling the Court held in even stronger terms that there are rights which no majority may destroy. The issue then before the Court was not precisely the right of the parent to control the education of the child, although this right was also affirmed in the Court's decision, but the right of a citizen to teach a foreign language in a

private school, and the right of parents to employ him to instruct their children. During the argument offered by Mr. Arthur Mullen of Omaha, Mr. Justice McReynolds interrupted to ask Mr. Mullen's view of the right of the State "to require all children to attend the public school. You will admit that, will you not?" The brief examination which then ensued prepared the way for the decision in the Oregon case. "I do not admit that," Mr. Mullen answered.

Mr. Justice McReynolds: You do not admit that?

Mr. Mullen: I do not admit that. I deny that a State can, by a majority of the legislature, require me to send my child to a public school. . . . [No] legislative majority can by its mere fiat take my children and require me to send them to a public school, and have the course of study absolutely controlled by the State. I deny that any such power exists under a constitutional government.

Mr. Mullen's views, accepted by the Court, were incorporated, in substance, in the Court's decision. Plainly, they are directly opposed to the view of Mr. Bryan. Plainly too, there is no support in either the Nebraska or the Oregon decision for Mr. Bryan's doctrine. In each case the Court rejected a so called right assumed by a majority.

Politically, Mr. Bryan is a Democrat. The founder of that party, Thomas Jefferson, is not the sole fountainhead of political wisdom, but his authority is respectable, and he once wrote, in phrases adopted by the State of Kentucky for her Bill of Rights, that absolute power over freemen exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority. Jefferson disagrees with his political son in anathematizing government by counting noses.

Snarks and Boojums at the Bar

SNARKS that have feathers and bite must be carefully distinguished, as the Bellman teaches, from snarks that have whiskers and scratch. But other snarks, as is now admitted, are boojums, and seem neither to bite or scratch. Their chief characteristic is that even in the midst of their laughter and glee, they softly and suddenly vanish away.

Did not so many cases reveal unmistakably the rapid growth of the boojum, it might seem improper to ask our Federal Courts, or Congress, to take up the study of snarks and boojums. The boojum, it must be understood, is really a snark. He becomes a boojum, or more properly, evinces his true character as a boojum, by the suddenness with which he vanishes from sight. If "snark" be taken to mean "witness," and "boojum" to signify "a vanishing witness," the contention that here is a case for our Courts to investigate, is seen to be by no means far-fetched.

The example of the lawyer who advised his client to admit guilt in a murder case, and then promptly turned all the snarks into boojums by sending them into an adjoining State, is not common, but our bar associations should make it impossible. This lawyer

put the legal machinery of a whole State into a bad plight, for besides the interests of justice, political issues were at stake. Perhaps the political day was saved, but so much cannot be said for justice. If a prosecuting attorney has a confession of guilt and nothing to prove that the confession is true, since all the witnesses have been spirited beyond his jurisdiction, he has precisely nothing. Only the stage convicts men on uncorroborated confessions.

But perhaps the public has not yet forgotten the flock of boojums in the Government's oil cases. The gentlemen accused by the Government may have been as innocent as babes in arms, but a boojum proves nothing except the non-presence of a snark. The cases thus far tried have been infested with boojums hunting in Africa, boojums hibernating along the sunny Riviera, and boojums who could present (by proxy) medical opinions certifying that the very sound of the word oil would wreck their frail constitutions.

Within the next few months the bar associations will convene in many States. They might do worse than to consider the study of snarks and boojums, with special reference to the process of preventing a snark from suddenly and silently vanishing away. The Bellman and all his crew failed to discover any process, but if our legal brethren wish to raise the bench and the bar in the esteem of the public, they will not fail.

Dressing for Judgment Day

IF in his addresses to the pilgrims in this year of jubilee, the Holy Father has thought it necessary to inveigh again and again against the prevailing style in women's dress, it is evident that the harm caused by this reversion to a corrupt paganism is real and deadly. The Pontiff is no seeker after notoriety, and he does not denounce non-existent evils. Speaking to the alumnae of the Convents of the Sacred Heart, gathered from all over the world to assist at the canonization of Blessed Madeleine Sophie, the Holy Father asked his hearers to make themselves apostles of modesty in dress, and he lately renewed this request when addressing a gathering of pilgrims from Spain. It is evident, then, that Pius XI considers the need of concerted action looking toward reform, as serious.

Following the example of His Holiness, many Italian Bishops, and in particular the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, have issued regulations, one effect of which is to close the churches against women whose costume is at variance with Christian modesty. The Cardinal writes that certain unbecoming modes of dress, "in every respect incompatible with the dignity and chastity which belong to women" now con-

stitute "a state of real danger and serious moral harm" which cannot be tolerated on the ground of convenience or social necessity. It is not the office of an ecclesiastic to prescribe styles or to furnish patterns according to which garments may be constructed, and no ecclesiastic has presumed to dictate in this respect to milliners and *couturiers*. But it is decidedly within the right, and is the duty, of every shepherd of souls to let his flock know that certain modes are frankly indecent, degrading to those who follow them, and a source of moral harm to others.

There are women who label the clergymen who undertakes the very uninviting task of guiding his flock aright in this delicate matter, as narrow-minded, or bigoted, or totally lacking the gift of understanding human nature. This rating is invariably based upon their ignorance of the work and office of the priest. In the tribunal of penance he probes deep into human souls, and in that sacred clinic learns the cause of spiritual disease, the remedy, and above all, methods of prevention. If he is occasionally obliged to warn his people against moral dangers, he does not speak from conjecture but from knowledge. Few men are so deeply versed in human nature as the experienced Catholic priest, a truth witnessed by two authors so widely diverse in their outlook as de Maupassant and Chesterton. If he knows the heights to which it may rightly aspire, he also knows what will keep it in the mire. Nor is the moralist alone in calling attention to the social evil occasioned by improper dress; with him are physicians, social workers, and even scientists.

In his study on "Civilization and Climate" Dr. Ellsworth Huntington of Yale strongly condemns the styles which "emphasize sex," and expresses his inability to understand why some women claim utter freedom from responsibility for the untoward results which follow such styles. Even if no personal injury is to be apprehended, "some other woman," he writes, "must pay the penalty." Surely a costume may be graceful, becoming, and perfectly modest; but the costumes worn by some of our young girls fail on every point of this description. Not only are they in bad taste, but many are positively indecent.

It is altogether possible that among these young people there are some who fail to realize the danger both to themselves and to others. But is it at all probable that their mothers are insensible to this peril? If so, they are appallingly ignorant of human nature. As for the excuse, "Well, that's the style" any Catholic mother can find the answer by asking herself if she would be willing to face Almighty God with that excuse on Judgment Day.

A remedy must be found and found quickly. But

if our Catholic women are not willing to lead the way, and to begin by making what reform may be necessary in their own homes, it will not be found at all. Hence the duty of obeying the Holy Father's wishes devolves primarily upon Catholic mothers, but teachers and all to whom the care of our young people is entrusted can do much in aiding a sorely-needed reform. It is not to be expected women will be content to dress like frumps or dowdies, but feminine ingenuity should be equal to the task of devising styles that are both graceful and modest.

Our New War with England

A WAR is now in progress between Great Britain and the United States. Thus far we have won two wars from our ancient opponent, but we now face defeat. The brunt of the battles to date has been borne by the Cunard Line for Great Britain, and by the Neptune Association of Masters and Mates of Ocean and Coastwise Steamship Vessels, Inc., for the United States. The first engagement took place in May, 1924, when the N. A. M. M. O. C. S. V., Inc. attacked the liner "Berengaria" alleging that this British ship regularly carried alcoholic beverages into port under the very nose of the Statue of Liberty and in defiance of the Statute of Volstead, while American ships were as dry as Sahara. After a brief encounter Federal Judge Knox decided that the British had won on all points. In September the Association turned its batteries against the Cunard Line, seven of its captains, and the Federal officials charged with the enforcement of the Volstead act. On July 14, Federal Judge Mack awarded the victory to the British, and the Association retired, with forebodings not unlike those which harrowed Louis XVI and the Royal Family, on July 14, 1789.

It is alleged by the Association that when Americans go to sea, they desire to enjoy a liberty denied them on land. As Britons never shall be slaves, they are exempted from obedience to Mr. Volstead's law, and are able to assuage the aridity of Americans who vote dry and drink wet. Since the British exemption was granted by treaty, the Federal District Courts have agreed that it is beyond their power to ease the grievances of the Neptune Association, if any exist.

This case is recommended to the attention of the Anti-Saloon League. It is not to be tolerated that any ship come into our highly moral ports under the pilotage of the demon rum. If the crew must drink, it should be compelled to patronize our hard-working, landlubberly bootleggers, while Americans who seek under the British flag a freedom which they are forbidden at home, should be shot at sunrise at the foot of the Statue of Liberty.

Dramatics

Our Loyal Audiences

THE most interesting feature of our stage life at this season is the temporary return of old-time favorites who feared we had forgotten them.

For some reason American audiences are held to be very fickle, and the theory has persisted despite plenty of evidence to the contrary. Operatic stars have tested it again and again by giving us a long series of farewell performances and, notably in the instances of Adelina Patti and Lilli Lehmann, they have been as warmly hailed as farewelled. Stars of the so called legitimate drama, however, and stars in the vaudeville field, are more coy about returning. Very modestly, indeed, almost humbly, they have considered themselves forgotten after we have had a few seasons without them. And yet, throughout the years, those who have been brave enough to come back have almost invariably been given a most cordial and enthusiastic welcome.

Madame Janauschek reappeared, after two decades, in a melodrama which held a Broadway stage for a year. Leslie Carter, after an absence almost as long, was equally successful when she returned a few seasons ago. Old Mrs. Whiffin, bless her gallant heart, can always count on a thunder of applause when she comes before us. John Drew, returning this spring, after only a few seasons of retirement, had the unique experience of seeing the entire first night audience of "Trelawney of the Wells" rise to welcome him most heartily in his first entrance upon the stage.

Producers, eliminating the possibility of public loyalty to old favorites, find various explanations of such cordiality. They tell us that these stars come back in big plays, "actor proof plays." Or they admit that such a man or woman star has what might be called a "hang-over of personality" whose effect endures through the years. But how will they explain the successful reappearance this season of not one but a dozen old stars of the vaudeville stage, who come before us after a lapse of a quarter of a century, to sing again the songs of long ago.

No new plays for them! And in most instances they had not even a new act. They simply ignored tradition and came back, relying on our memory of the days when we were all young together to repeat for us the songs that had made them famous. And, behold, they learned that the loyal audiences had forgotten neither them nor their songs.

The most spectacular "come-back" of the season was that of Fay Templeton, former star of Weber and Fields and, in her day, more than a quarter of a century ago, one of the idols of the vaudeville stage. In that day of hers Miss Templeton was young and beautiful, with a superb figure and an enchanting contralto voice. Weber

and Fields, too, lay very close to the popular heart. So when it was announced last month that the three were to reappear on the stage of the Palace Theater in New York, all the old-timers, and there are many such, turned out to welcome them.

They came on the stage together, and as the audience looked at Weber and Fields thirty years rolled backward and we were all in the "nineties" again. In their make-up the two favorites looked not one day older than they had looked at the period of their greatest triumphs. Then, alas, Miss Templeton left the rolling chair in which she had been wheeled toward the footlights and—we were all middle-aged again! For the years, which had dealt so kindly with Weber and Fields, had not been so merciful to the famous beauty who had starred with them. The audience metaphorically rubbed its eyes, and stared, and even gasped. Fay Templeton, arch enchantress of her day, stood before us, if indeed it was she at all, lost in folds upon folds of flesh. She was huge. She must have weighed two hundred and fifty pounds. Her once lovely face was as round as a full moon under her white hair, and it suggested as much "temperament" as that burned out planet suggests.

A strange little sigh swept over the big audience, a sigh of pity, of irrepressible regret; but every man and woman gave this changeling a welcoming round of applause.

Then, suddenly, Miss Templeton began to sing, and at the first notes the audience gasped once more and sat up, fascinated and thrilled. For time had not been merciless, after all. It had left the old star her greatest possession, her beautiful voice, and as the familiar, rich notes came from this mountain of flesh on the stage the audience burst into almost hysterical applause, the applause of mingled delight and relief.

Miss Templeton was singing "Dinah," the great song which so many of her auditors had heard her sing in her hey-day. Incredibly, she was singing it much as she had sung it then. They made her keep on singing it. They brought her out, again and still again. When she tried to thank them tears streamed down her cheeks, but she was not crying alone. Not a few of those in her audience had wet eyes, too!

Since then, the newspaper critics have devoted much space to efforts to explain this phenomenon. A number of them have ended by admitting that they could not explain it. Others have talked about "personality." But to the writer of these lines the explanation is simple enough.

American audiences *are* loyal. They are anxious to be loyal. They are delighted to welcome their old friends. In the case of Miss Templeton they had one paralyzing moment of disappointment and disillusionment. But when

she sang they realized that, after all, she had brought a great deal back to them. The voice they had loved was still there, and the singer's art. And as the moments passed, so great was the spell of the voice and the art that the old personality also struggled through the heavy envelope of flesh. Thus while the notes of "Dinah" tugged at the strings of heart and memory the audience saw Fay Templeton, not as she stood before them but as she used to be. They were relieved and delighted to see her and to hear her thus, and, accordingly, they let themselves go.

It was as if they could not have enough of her. Weber and Fields were forgotten. A little later Cissy Loftus, that incomparable artiste in her line, stood by Miss Templeton's side almost unseen, while "Dinah" was sung again. It was an orgy of mass emotion, an experience unique in the American theater. But there is no sense in trying to find long names for it, or in writing essays about it. It simply means that American audiences are loyal!

Audiences were loyal to Eddie Leonard when he made his "come back" last month. They were loyal to Marie Cahill when she made hers. They were loyal to Weber and Fields when they finally remembered that these splendid old favorites were also present. But Leonard and Miss Cahill and Weber and Fields had not changed very much. It was easy to be loyal to them. Miss Templeton had changed, shockingly, in one respect. In all other respects she was the same, and there was a thrill in the discovery, a rapture in celebrating it, that gave her audience one of the "big moments" we read so much about and so rarely experience.

ELIZABETH JORDAN.

ON WINGS OF SONG

The light words dropped to silence on my tongue
And I again was loving, gay and young;
And I forgot the knowledge that is life,
The body's toiling and the spirit's strife—
Sweet tears my burning eyelids bathed, the scars
My swelling heart pressed on its prison bars
Were eased of their long agony and cooled,
And I once more remembered that God ruled;
Such blessed pangs of yearning pierced me through,
The sound of voices, glint of morning dew,
The spicy odors that new buds exhale,
The gleam of sods upturned adown the vale,
The breath of flowers floating in the air,
Mist-shrouded faces hovering here and there
Like shreds of things we dream about the dead
That stay and haunt us when the dream has fled;
Down youth and hope and beauty's pleasant lane
I went, enraptured with that spherul strain,
Yea, and dear friends went with me, who are dead,
And long have lain with stone at feet and head;
The dun clouds parted on our sky's soft blue,
Those blue deeps opened and our souls went through—
When she sang!

MARGARET H. LAWLESS.

REVIEWS

The Cruise of the Nona. By HILAIRE BELLOC. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. \$4.50.

There are certain people who converse best when there is sufficient action to stimulate them but not so much disturbance that good talk becomes a burden. This is the class to which Mr. Belloc, in his "The Cruise of the Nona," belongs. As with men, so with books, each has its "atmosphere." One of the best places in the world to read this book would be the top of the Woolworth building. "The Cruise of the Nona" is a book of action, and withal, a book of reflectiveness, of deep, quiet thought. It has to do as the sub-title announces, with "a cruise from the Holyhead to the Wash, with reflections and judgments on life and letters, men and manners." A good description. And when you recall that the author is not only a scholar but a man of affairs, and add your knowledge of Mr. Belloc as gathered from his other books, you will aptly conclude that the reflections and judgments are worth while, solid, sympathetic, broad, interesting and scholarly. The style itself is an inducement to read the volume. As a fitting place for perusing the volume, the top of the Woolworth tower was suggested. But any place will do as well, provided it commands a view of busy waters, of streets wherein men move like shadows and yet remain real men in a real strife; provided, too, there is a great stretch of landscape, and a mighty city with the struggle and bustle subdued to a mere hum. Meanwhile, from your vantage point of retirement though not of seclusion, you will realize the solemn reality of the throbbing scene and be moved to appreciate a wise man's thoughts on life and letters, men and manners, cabbages and kings. F. McN.

The Higher Life. By ALBERT MUNTSCH, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. \$1.75.

"This is the will of God, your sanctification," wrote St. Paul, and he was but echoing for his first converts the injunction of the Saviour Himself to all His followers, "Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." It is to emphasize this same truth for a generation that has substituted false for true standards of living that Father Muntsch has written his latest book. "The volume," he says in his Preface, "is really a defense in modern terminology of the Catholic idea of holiness." People at large would measure a worthy and meritorious life in terms of altruism, service, culture; for the Christian all these are false norms, inefficient substitutes for the grace of God in which the "Higher Life" really consists. Practical holiness means fighting against the three concupiscences, rooting sin out of the soul and living the life of sanctifying grace. We are a fallen race. Yet there is the consolation that our inclination to sin does not hold us slaves to iniquity. With God's grace every child of Adam can rise above the limitations that hamper his well-being and it is this that constitutes the "Higher Life." When individuals regulate their actions according to the canons of sound morality, supernaturalized by grace, then the much needed reconstruction of family life and social life will take care of itself. For it is folly to speak of the amelioration of social order and the inauguration of the era of the universal brotherhood unless the individual be first converted to proper ideals of Christian conduct. Father Muntsch's book will furnish food for thought for men and women of all creeds but especially for our Catholic social leaders.

W. L.

Aspects of the Modern Short Story. By ALFRED C. WARD. New York: The Dial Press.

In the author's foreword the purpose of this volume is aptly put: "The aim of the present series of brief studies is to undertake an analytical survey of representative short stories by certain modern authors who have combined literary merit with popular appeal."

The productions of Hawthorne, Poe, Harte, Stevenson, Kipling, Conrad, Quiller-Couch, de la Mare, Tchekov, and Katherine Mansfield are among these appraisals. In effect the author has lived up to his initial declaration. His appreciations are most attractively expressed and, based on well defined principles, are normal and consistent. He is humble enough not to claim the achievement of finality. The introduction contains an exposition of the Gospel parables in the technique of short stories and from them are deduced five captions for subsequent application. In brief these consider the quality and value of plot material; the launching of the plot without fumbling or fouling and the harborage at the journey's end with precision and speed; the simplicity of style; the individuality of the people of the story; the use of words consistently with progressive movement. There is abundant information in chapters that are analytical and rich in biographical and literary comparisons and contrasts. Stories are seen already made and in the making, while their creators, familiar to one who has lingered in the literary workshop, are presented without affectation, with much understanding, tolerance and sympathy. An understudy in the custom-house of letters might easily be directed to catch here the courteous spirit and the technical method of one who neatly mingles pleasure and profit. J. E. L.

Under the Black Flag. By DON C. SEITZ. New York: The Dial Press. \$4.00.

These stories of thirty captains who roved the seas under the ominous black flag, "Gentlemen of fortune, from the sea," as they chose to announce themselves, with all the gallantry of their profession and all the deviltry attributed to them in fancy and fiction, give an authentic account of the whole history of piracy. The pirate is justly hated and feared but the story of his wild adventures is ever fascinating. This is a book crammed full of incident and romance, which enacts scenes of robbery and plunder with the same vividness that the stage threw about "Blackbeard." Pirate honor or the pirate code is not always edifying, yet a certain admiration is due these rogues who took their prize or went to the gallows with equal courage. A reward on their heads or a traitor in their midst could not keep them from the quest of gold and a free man's life on the bounding main. Here is the story of lawless men, interesting men, cruel men, yet men with a reckless honesty. Too honest to call their profession by any other than its proper name, they came announced to push their claims and relished opposition. In the name of justice all men cry them down, but though their deeds are black as night and often crimson, the recounting of them cannot fail to interest as no further harm is done by immortalizing the rogues. As a profession piracy belongs to a cruder civilization; but who can fail to contrast the avowed "gentlemen of fortune" with the gentlemen of a more advanced civilization who acquire other's fortunes, not so bravely, yet no less surely. T. A. D.

The Reforging of Russia. By EDWIN W. HULLINGER. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co.

"For five years Russia had been a land of the minor tone. A land of sorrow, a land of broken hearts, a tragic symphony into which the nation had poured all its throbbing soul." Civil strife, famine, executions had taken their toll of millions of lives. Other millions had been exiled. The country was wrecked spiritually, physically, socially and economically. There was no freedom of speech, no liberty of the press; on the contrary, there was widespread espionage, arrest, farcical trial, imprisonment and execution, sometimes even on mere suspicion. A handful of men remained in power because they retained the loyalty of the army. They retained the loyalty of the army because they fed and clothed the soldiers when food and clothing were scarce in Russia. They freed themselves from fear of counter-revolution by the exquisitely simple plan of shooting or imprisoning not merely

those who actually opposed the government but even those who might possibly offer opposition. The picture is still grim, as the author says, but he sees gleams of hope through the darkness. Communism, for the most part, was dropped in 1921; the peasants are planting again, trade is being resumed and the Communists are smirking at foreign capital. The author has a gift for graphic description and moving contrast. While he does not hesitate to reveal the atrocities and the stupidity of the Bolsheviki, he does not waste time ranting against them. For him humanity is more important than government. And for that vast horde of humanity which is Russia, he finds hope in the vast untapped resources of the country and the natural resiliency of the Russian character. J. A. L.

Absurdities of Evolution. By GUY FITCH PHELPS. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. \$1.25.

At a time when the country has gone mad over Evolution and an apparent desire for popularity has caused so many professors and pulpit orators to align themselves with defenders of a false system of philosophy, comes this brief and pointed refutation in a popular style of the fallacies of modern Evolution. Setting aside entirely the religious problems involved in the discussion, the author attacks the theory on a scientific basis and shows, one after another, the weaknesses of the evolutionist's position. His logic is accurate, his language vigorous and trenchant, his expression fearless. Though Catholics cannot approve all that he asserts and stylists may question the propriety of some of his diction, there is no denying he makes his subject interesting and his conclusions unanswerable. Because he proves his assertions, he is not afraid to state that "in spite of all the extravagant claims made by those who profess to believe it there has not been a single fact produced upon which the tottering, dizzy, drunken theory may stand. . . . It is a fraud, a black mistake, promulgated by conceit and 'scientific' dishonesty." The chapters on the "Dishonesty of Evolutionists," and "Evolution and Science Contrasted," are especially telling. Our public-school students who are being surfeited with the false claims of Evolution will find in these pages very helpful matter for sane thinking. W. L.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

When Putting on Plays.—Such a book as "Acting and Play Production" (Longmans, Green. \$2.50), by Harry Lee Andrews and Bruce Weirick, should always be kept on the dramatic director's desk and not in his bookcase. For the manual will yield him the information he wants here and now, or at least will tell him where he can obtain it quickly. Plays and books on make-up, staging, costuming, lighting, directing and acting, are listed with the names and locations of their publishers. No phase of dramatic work is left untouched. The treatment is clear, concise and practical; it is accompanied with excellent photographs of telling scenes from the best plays to illustrate the principles. The simple and clear diagrams, too, of various possible stage settings are most serviceable. If dramatic clubs are looking for a very simple and practical handbook for everything connected with play-production they will find it within the compass of this volume. It will cheer the heart of the director who is wise enough to insist that the actor create his own role and that movement, gesture and voice-inflection follow from this creation.

Educating in the High School.—Food for thought is furnished to high school principals and teachers in a new work touching closely the success of an up-to-date high school in "Extra-Curricular Activities in the High School" (Richmond, Va.: Johnson Publishing Co.), by Charles R. Foster. The author is not airing a pet theory, although his expressed purpose is to give the underlying principles involved rather than practices obtaining through-

out the country. The proper educational values of such activities are duly emphasized. Practical results have shown that through such activities an interest is created in the student and an ambition to put his training and his personal ability to a test with success as his goal.—As a textbook for secondary education, Willis L. Uhl, Ph.D., offers "Principles of Secondary Education" (Silver, Burdett). It is based upon the writings of representative educators. The important questions considered are the American plan for secondary education, the secondary-school teacher and pupil, secondary education in foreign countries, and the reorganization movement. Copiously supplied with documentary evidence, each chapter is closed with suggestions for study and discussion.

Foreign Manuals on History and Art.—Everyone interested in the technique of history will be glad to learn that Alfred Feder, S.J., has considerably revised and enlarged his "Lehrbuch der geschichtlichen Methode" (Regensburg, Verlag Josef Kösel) which was very favorably reviewed in our pages on its first appearance. Some sections have been entirely remodeled.—The fact that Ludwig Pastor has written the little volume on "Die Fresken der Sixtinischen Kapelle und Raffaels Fresken in den Stanzien und den Loggien des Vatikans" (Herder, \$1.20), will be sufficient to recommend it to every lover of both art and history. It is filled with most detailed information and glows with enthusiasm for its exalted subjects.—Three more collections of the "Arte Sacra Italiana" (Marietti, L.10) have lately been published. They are "S. Caterina da Siena," "La Vergine nel rinascimento e nei Barocco," and "La Vergine dalle origini al rascimento." Each contains thirty-two beautiful half-tone reproductions from the ancient masters, with an introduction and a brief history of each picture.

Life Interpreted by the Poets.—"Our Lady Courtesy" splendidly opens a collection of verse by Alexander J. Cody, S.J., in a volume entitled "Our Lady Courtesy and Other Poems" (University of Santa Clara Press). The tribute to Our Lady is delicately done, rich in contrasts and gentle idealizations of nature and man. Thereafter follow shorter poetic tributes and some longer pieces woven on an ancient Spanish background. "The Two Mothers," Mary and the Mother of Iscariot on Calvary, is from the very possibilities of the material, dramatically the strongest.—James Stevens presents restfully "A Poetry Recital" (Macmillan, \$1.50). Herein aspects of life close to earth are glimpsed with a bit of light fancy, often with a moral twist. There are pen pictures which progress on the easy stages of recurrent catch phrases, and effusions, either classic in mold or decidedly Celtic with the lilt and airiness of "the morning—O." The expression is natural and rhythmic. Crude vigor and unkindliness touch the extreme in "Righteous Anger." Surely, "The lanky hank of a she in the inn over there," with all allowances for realism, merited less.—The announcement card of "The Banquet and Other Poems" (Dorrance, \$2.00), by Frances Fletcher, heralds verse that uncannily reflects the modern spirit, the striving for individualism, the seeking for answers to the unanswerable. Of course, only once in a blue moon are such assertions propitious. They generally prelude much thin piping perversely out of tune. Miss Fletcher, however, is musical enough. The range of her melodies is limited to "trifling feats of artistry."—A quiet passion thrills through the love poems that are included in "Just Echoes" (New York: F. H. Hitchcock, \$1.50), by France Frederick. It is not the grand, overwhelming passion, but it is sincere and authentic. In this group of poems there is ever present the sadness of regret as an undertone. In the several nature poems, fancy plays charmingly about such obvious things as blue skies and turbulent seas. The remaining selections phrase the humble philosophy of friendship and good cheer.

The Polyglots. The Love Complex. A Good Man. A Son of Cincinnati. Rosalie. The Deductions of Colonel Gore.

Connected with every war is that class of petty officials who live by the fighting but not in it. Such are the characters of "The Polyglots" (Duffield, \$2.50), by William Gerhardt. They are representatives of many nations, some are compounded from several racial strains. They form an absurd and farcical group and as such are portrayed brilliantly by Mr. Gerhardt. The connecting link of the narrative is the meditative reaction of a young man to these people and the history of his love. This latter phase is occasionally unbecomingly detailed. The only normal passages in the book are those descriptive of the very charming children, particularly the short-lived Natasha. In its stilted preciousness, the writing almost rivals that of Michael Arlen. Save as a colorful canvas portraying many peculiar people, the novel has little significance.

Impulse and natural attraction, that are impatient of restraint and that are surcharged for the moment by dissatisfaction with the conservative and restricted ways of a student, motivate both the drive and the terrific action of Thomas Dixon's "The Love Complex" (Boni, Liveright, \$2.00). The story embraces nearly all the possibilities by which hectic passion grips interest and runs a climax to physical and moral nakedness. The prurient will not be benefited by these pages. Actual imprudences and "larks" are never smoothed by the final kisses and the rescues of fiction.

George F. Hummel has compressed much irony even in the title of his latest book, "A Good Man" (Boni, Liveright, \$2.00). Here is a sparkling story of the busy business man, the popular hero of civic and religious causes, the cheery fellow of all gatherings, the devoted husband and father. Beneath the surface, here is the hypocrite that the code of Puritanism frequently begets. The good man has no conscience in playing the game of life. The novel is written with humorous bitterness. Its profanity could well have been omitted without loss of atmosphere or characterization.

The early nineteenth century when woodsmen left their plantations and their flat river-boats to fight the Indians is the period of "A Son of Cincinnati" (Small, Maynard, \$2.00), by Montague Brisard. A disgraced son of a member of the famous Order of Cincinnati resolves to win back his right to wear the insignia. Life among the Indians and experiences with unscrupulous whites test his resolution. These and his romance with a beautiful heroine keep the narrative alive to the very last.

The reputation of Charles Major as a novelist would never have been first established by his latest book, "Rosalie" (Macmillan, \$2.00). It is mostly sentiment and sentimentality. Dr. Collingwood is good, Rosalie is good and pure and true, of the morning-glory type. But the plot lacks spontaneity as well as probability, and uses such old devices as shipwrecks, rescues and the like to bring the lovers together. The villain Gabriel adds some interest but not sufficient to make the story enthralling. The book ends as all orthodox novels should end, and that is what the vacation reader mostly desiderates.

Entertaining but not intense or hair-raising is "The Deductions of Colonel Gore" (Harper, \$2.00), by Lynn Brock. If one concedes a bit to improbability the story interests. A note of individuality is in the characters, especially in that of Colonel Gore who is high-minded, loyal, and willing to make sacrifices for the woman he has always loved. The needle of investigation veers up and down and around, threatens to pause where the local "yellow" will derive unlimited copy, until with a 180 per cent whirl it stops, almost on the last page, where the seasoned mystery-taster finds a genuine surprise.

Sociology

Electoral Vigilance

A WRITTEN Constitution has decided advantages over an unwritten one. In it the functions of government are clearly defined and limits surveyed beyond which encroachment is unlawful. Whether it consists of a grant of power, as does the Constitution of the United States, or is a limitation of already existing sovereignty, as in the case of the various State Constitutions, a written Constitution serves the great end of clarifying authority, of explaining and describing exactly when, where, to what extent and in what manner the government may act.

All of our American Constitutions contain sections, more or less identical, which are usually called "The Bill of Rights," because in them, as in the original English model, certain inherent rights, such as freedom of speech and of religion, trial by jury, etc., are defined and protected.

In America, the attempted passage of a law which violates any of these protected rights is utterly void and of no force. The legislature may enact such a statute with all the pomp and formality at its command. Nevertheless, the statute is not law and never was law, from the very moment of its passage. Our Constitutions do not merely forbid their respective legislative bodies to pass certain limits. They actually destroy the power of the legislatures to cross those limits, or, as in the case of the Federal Constitution, they prevent such power from ever coming into existence. If a disputed statute is tested in the courts, the latter will say that a law which violates a Constitution can never exist; that such a situation is a contradiction in terms; that if the constitutional violation be admitted, there can be no law at all but only an empty gesture on the part of the law-making body.

We Americans, because of our well-founded trust in the efficiency and integrity of our courts, are sometimes inclined to pass to them the responsibility of curing defective legislation. While Representatives and Senators debate before voting upon an obnoxious statute, we voters are apt to sit back complacently, trusting that if the statute be passed, the courts will protect us by declaring it to be unconstitutional.

This leads to mental apathy and flabbiness. One cannot have good muscles without physical exercise. One cannot do intellectual feats without mental exercise. Unless the electorate assumes the responsibility of thinking out problems which confront the government, it cannot assume to pass an intelligent opinion upon those problems. To the extent that we are mentally lazy, we are not self-governing. To the extent that we are slothful in thinking for ourselves, we must allow our thinking to be done for us by others. It makes no difference whether those others are called Senators, Representatives and judges, or whether they bear the titles of barons, earls

and dukes. It makes no difference whether the guise and formulae of a representative form of government are retained. The sole test is this: Are the men, who actually enact and enforce the laws, guided by their own untrammelled judgment or do they act as agents of an intelligent citizenry, whose wishes they know and respect?

In the former case, the people have no more power than a constitutional king. In the latter case, even though the form of the government is monarchical and aristocratic, the substance is democratic.

All governments are operated either by the intelligent few or the intelligent many. We pride ourselves on belonging to the second class. But unless we think for ourselves, unless we set out to solve the political problems confronting us, is our pride justified? We cannot escape the obligations and enjoy the benefits of self-government. We must either exercise the mental effort necessary to rule ourselves or surrender the boon of being self-ruled.

Where people lack a written Constitution which protects their inalienable rights, they are put upon their mettle in electing to office only men who will not trample upon those rights. If such a race has any instinct for ruling itself, it must, in very self-defense, make a decidedly intelligent choice of its officials. This is the secret of the personal liberty of the Englishman. He has no constitutional bulwark absolutely guarding his right to pray, talk or eat. The British Parliament has the very broadest power. It could pass any kind of a law imaginable and it would be a valid law, legally speaking. Parliament *could* order all of the inhabitants of England to shave the left sides of their heads or to read a Sura of the Koran every morning before breakfast. But Parliament will not exercise its theoretical omnipotence because any administration unfavorable to the electorate is promptly turned out of power. The Englishman, by his vigilance, protects his own rights. He does not need the aid of a written Constitution.

We should acquire a little more of this vigilance in the United States. We should not permit arbitrary and obnoxious legislation to be enacted in the first place. A supine reliance upon the power of the courts to protect us, by later declaring such legislation unconstitutional, is insufficient. We may be left in the lurch. Some of the worst laws which we have are perfectly constitutional. Besides, such a mental lethargy destroys our power to pass intelligently upon matters at issue. We Americans, whatever be our creed or party, must exercise our electoral privilege strenuously and alertly if we are to escape being bossed and dominated and bullied by a horde of petty czars enforcing petty laws. A written "Bill of Rights" may protect us to a large extent. But as between us and a people possessing no such written "Bill of Rights" but exercising a careful and intelligent interest in the election and conduct of its legislators and executives, our rights are less secure.

DANIEL J. MCKENNA.

Education

The Ideal System of Moral Training

IT must not be thought that because it is difficult to formulate one's theory of morality or explain one's motives, therefore there are no motives. Motives do and must exist. Without them there can be no action. At first, such motives are embodied in parents and teachers whom children trust and obey. "We desire," says Sister Mary very truly, in her Monograph on moral tests, "our children to be morally developed. The only way to accomplish this is to train the child from infancy in the performance of specific moral acts. This training must go on at all times and at all places to be effective." The science of ethics teaches that no act of a rational being is or can be in practice devoid of morality. Therefore children are trained in virtue by every conscious and deliberate act. Habits of health, habits of deportment are developed from infancy. The motives of obedience in these habits and in virtuous habits should be made to appear reasonable when the child is in condition to act from enlightened motives, but as in health, so in morality faith is and must be for the larger part of mankind the necessary condition for action. All cannot be doctors, nor all moralists. Sister Mary thinks that motives should be enlightened at the ages at which she found her average pupils able to express such motives. One objection to this conclusion is that the average does not show us what can be done but only what is perhaps being done at the time of one test, and another objection is that motives are operating consciously and rationally long before they can be satisfactorily expressed to an examiner.

Religion offers the most pervasive and the most impelling motives for morality and did not history show a close connection between morality and religion, the nature of religious truth would show the connection. The goodness, the mercy, the justice of God and His all-seeing eye, if these facts are transmuted into motives, pervade and dominate every act, even the most secret of the human heart. Religion, too, furnishes mankind with the noblest ideas of morality and the finest exemplars of such morality. The problem of the educator is to bring religion to bear upon every act, through good parents, through good teachers, through attractive ideals, through motives of loving faith and finally through enlightened motives, when and how the best, and not the average, experience of mankind has shown such great motives can be made intelligible and can be even in some cases adequately expressed by children.

The most serious detriment to education which is likely to follow from the use of average tests, is the substitution of the average for the ideal. Some have thought such a result improbable and illusory. Yet in the Monograph we have been discussing, we have an instance of tests based on the single performance of a few, and these tests averaged on still fewer, and the suggestion is offered that

such tests should be made the standard. It is true that the average of any higher age may be made perhaps to serve as the ideal of a lower age, but "I am as good as the next" is a motive to which human nature is only too much prone and a motive that is usually a salve for laziness. What does the athlete do? What the stock-raiser? Burbank wishes to improve a strain. Does he take the average or does he take the exceptional? Do we study art from the average artists? What we should have been glad to have from four thousand youths would be the record and history of those who rated high in moral tests. From them we might have learned some new methods of developing morality or at least of cultivating early and vigorous concepts of morality.

The time is ripe for a fruitful system of moral training. Within recent years the Popes have continually and insistently demanded better catechetical instruction. The new Code of Canon Law has its pertinent legislation. A resume of papal enactments is given in the *Nouvelle Revue Theologique* of Louvain, March, 1925, and the array of documents is formidable. The subject of religious instruction is a perennial one at the meetings of the Catholic Educational Association. Delegates will remember the splendid discussion at Cleveland two years ago and will rejoice to see that the two leaders in that discussion have put their views into available print. Father John M. Cooper has published the first volume of his "Religion Outlines for College," and he has begun to show how through sound pedagogy ethics and moral theology can be converted into virtue and morality. Father Joseph A. Dunney, Inspector of Schools, for the Albany Diocese, has issued an attractive book on the Mass bringing its moral force to bear upon the education of character. No one who heard at Cleveland Father Dunney outline his complete and detailed course, embracing the history, the liturgy, the dogmatic and moral teaching of the Church can quite forget the excellence and very practical nature of that course. The extreme modern position demands that every phase of education be subjected to empiric tests, but it is conceit or excessive idolatry of the present which would attempt to refashion all the education on tests, and on those tests that give the average of a limited number in contemporary America. What of the pragmatic probation of time! What of the empiricism of history! Why not test all ages and all countries if we are to fashion a school of morality! Test empirically every child of the world if you would draw up a program based solely on average, the low average of mankind.

Moral reforms have not originated in the average of the multitude. Reforms are the product of individuals, discontented with the average and inspired with the ideal. Look at the Religious Orders of the Catholic Church. Their individual founders all initiated schools of morality. St. Benedict and St. Ignatius, with many another would contribute vital elements to one who wished to draw up

a course in virtue. Such a one could take the humanity and Christian naturalism of St. Francis of Assisi, the crystal-clear and university comprehensiveness of Aquinas and other sons of St. Dominic, the cultured college methods of the soldiers of St. Ignatius, the living vigor in the schools of St. John Baptist de LaSalle, and the educational wisdom of hundreds of others. Surely we Catholics have materials for fashioning a perfect system of developing virtue. If we have to go elsewhere at times for the principles and practice of other teachings, there surely is no need to do so for moral teaching. What are the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola but an intensive training in sanctity? They have been tested empirically for centuries; their moral training is for the adult, but is there in the Exercises no curriculum of virtue, no project method of goodness, no grading, no system, no pedagogy of the soul which could be applied to the developing of children's characters?

Suppose that nineteen hundred years ago some candidate for the doctorate at Rome or Athens or Jerusalem had sent out questions on morality and tabulated the answers of four thousand Roman or Greek or Hebrew children, what would have been the average ethical knowledge in that case? What tables and tests would there be to publish in the Monographs of ancient universities?

That average, we may rest assured, would not have had any of the divine ferment which then was beginning to leaven the world in Palestine. There the ideal, the divine ideal, was presented even to the little ones, and they in faith and obedience grasped it. There began the most wonderful, the most tremendous experiment in moral education ever attempted. A day that has witnessed nineteen hundred years after His death a Life of Christ as a best seller, has potent and palpable proof that the Gospel enshrines still supreme motives and perfect methods to integrate a sublime course of moral teachings if our educators would test that book and standardize the ideal and not the average.

FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S.J.

Note and Comment

Pilgrimages to Martyrs' Shrine

THE shrine of Blessed Isaac Jogues and the Jesuit martyrs at Auriesville, N. Y., forty-one miles west of Albany, may be reached either by train on the West Shore Railroad, direct to Auriesville, or by the New York Central to Fonda and thence by taxi through Fultonville. During the month of August, the West Shore train will leave Union Station, Albany, on Sundays at 9:00 a. m.; on other Sundays and on all week-days at 10:00 a. m. The roads from east and west to Auriesville are good for motor traffic.

The dates already arranged for organized pilgrimages are as follows: August 2, by Schenectady Council No. 201, Knights of Columbus, direction of Mr. Earl W.

Madigan, 36 Lafayette Street, Schenectady, N. Y., and August 30, from St. John's Church, Utica, N. Y., under direction of Father David J. Dooling, the pastor. The dates of the other regular pilgrimages are: August 9, from Albany; August 16 from Syracuse; and August 23 from Cohoes, Troy and nearby places. These three pilgrimages will be managed by Mr. E. C. Harper, Academy of the Sacred Heart, Kenwood, Albany, N. Y. September 6, will be devoted to Automobile Pilgrimage Day from all parts of the Mohawk Valley. Preparations are under way for two pilgrimages from New York and Brooklyn, on August 16. Mrs. A. E. Vesper, 64 West Eighty-eighth Street, New York, N. Y., will arrange for the Catholic Daughters of America of the New York district, and Mr. William A. Spring, 1185 Gates Avenue, Brooklyn, will arrange to take care of the Brooklyn pilgrims.

"Burbanking the Shamrock"

WHEN Shakespeare wrote of gilding refined gold or painting the lily he never thought of Burbanking the shamrock. That attempt, as the reader may know, was recently made. But Luther Burbank is quoted as reporting to the Celtic Fellowship that while he tried to improve the shamrock he could not make it bloom worthy to be the Celtic national flower. A substitute for the shamrock must therefore be found that may be more susceptible to the kindly offices of Mr. Burbank—say for instance the Shasta daisy. On which the editor of the *Milwaukee Journal* waxes eloquent:

Why doesn't Luther suggest attaching Ireland to the mainland, giving up the name of Erin, introducing serpents, or adopting a new Patron Saint? If he cannot change the shamrock's bloom, how does he expect to change the hearts of men in which for centuries the little shamrock has been an emblem of devotion that was stronger than death?

"I cannot change this little flower," says Burbank, so he suggests a change of Celtic nature. Man, does he think he can drop loyalty from human hearts, as he would cultivate the prickles from a gooseberry? He might better try to make the shamrock a palm tree than to substitute some more flamboyant bloom. As well change the name of Shaamon or drop from the vocabulary of love the tender word mavourneen.

So we presume that, with the whole spring catalogue of flowers to choose from, the incorrigible Irish will still continue to chant the glories of "the shamrock, the shamrock, the green, immortal shamrock," as the favored leaf of Erin's chief, and other sentiments to that effect. But more than incidentally the shamrock is for the Irish also an emblem connected with their Faith, and so doubly precious.

The Nicene Creed

HAIR-SPLITTING has ever been the slur cast on logical thought, including of course, if not singling out scholastic philosophy and Catholic theology. The point at issue, it is claimed, becomes obscured in an infinity of metaphysical distinctions and untranslatable

technical terms. In reality, however, it is merely the logician laying bare the sophisms of the rhetorician and keeping him to the point. Whether the discussion rotates about an expression, a word or a single letter, at the bottom of it is the thought to be expressed—the whole truth. Perhaps the most famous of all discussions, one that hinged on the apparently insignificant Greek letter "I," was that championed by Athanasius against the semi-Arians. That letter "I" made the "homo-ousios" of Nicaea into "homoi-ousios"; made the eternal truth of a Divine Trinity but a semblance. An appreciation of the importance of such a difference appeared in an article signed by P. W. Wilson in the *New York Times Magazine*, July 12. Eulogizing Athanasius, Mr. Wilson states:

The point on which he fought may be put into one letter of the alphabet, the important letter "I." How many of those who at holy communion repeat the words, "of one substance with the Father," realize that these words shattered the unity of Christendom? Was it to be "homo-ousios" or "homoi-ousios"—one substance or a similar substance?

And commenting on the worth of the discussion, he adds:

We may say that men were foolish to quarrel. But they, as we, were desperately eager for truth. The scientist searches for atoms. They searched the eternities and expressed omnipotence in an alphabet. No wonder that they were particular over the letter "I."

No wonder, too, that the truth expressed has outlived sixteen centuries. The Nicene Creed, as we have it today, was issued in A.D. 381 and is recited in all the Churches which profess faith in the Most Adorable Trinity.

Visit of a Prominent Educator

THE *Canadian Freeman* of July 9 announces the arrival in Toronto of Brother A. Charles, Superior General of the Christian Brothers, on a visit to the houses of that Congregation in the United States, Canada and the West Indies. He was accompanied from Europe by Brother Phillip, Assistant General for the United States. This is the first time that a Superior General of the Brothers has ever come to America although, as Assistant General, Brother Charles has visited Canada. He is an accomplished linguist, speaking English, Spanish and Italian fluently, as well as his native tongue, French. Previous to his election as Superior General and sixteenth successor of St. John De La Salle, he held many important posts, having been successively Director of the famous Technical School of St. Nicholas in Paris, Provincial of the Paris Province, and Assistant General for Central America and for Canada.

The Dominicans in Ohio

HAVING declined the recent translation to Cincinnati Bishop Chartrand has been reappointed to the see of Indianapolis, and Bishop John T. McNicholas, O.P., of Duluth, has been appointed Metropolitan of Cincinnati

by the Holy Father. The Sons of St. Dominic in this distinction so worthily bestowed on the Bishop of Duluth return among the hierarchy to familiar territory, for the Dominican missionaries did much for the early progress of the Church in Ohio in the spiritual care they took of the pioneer Catholics. A writer in the *Catholic Columbian* "Romain" recalls the fact that:

On July fourth, one hundred years ago, a work was undertaken in Ohio which meant much to the State in more ways than one. It was the building of the canal which was to link Lake Erie with the Ohio River. The first spadeful of earth was turned by Governor Clinton of New York. But the subsequent digging which was done was significant in another sense. Work upon the canal brought many men from the East. Among them was a considerable number of Irishmen. In fact, their number was so great that the struggling village of Cleveland, where they first settled, doubled its population within a single year. These Catholic workmen were spread along the canal as far as Akron. Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, upon being informed of their arrival, sent missionary priests to visit them. One of these was the Very Rev. Stephen T. Badin, the first priest ordained in the United States.

The anniversary has significance other than that of a State celebration. It marks the arrival of the first Catholic residents of Cleveland, and it also marks the foundation of the city of Akron. When the canal had been dug as far as Akron some of the workmen decided to remain there upon the banks of the upper Cuyahoga rather than move southward. Thus Akron got its start.

A Survey of the U. S.

THE live editor of the *Denver Catholic Register* has just finished a survey of a large part of these United States and a few extracts from his report are stimulating and illuminating:

The writer recently drove by automobile from Colorado to New York and Pennsylvania, and while he had made the same trip by train a number of times, he was amazed at the beauty of the country, now seen as never before. The cities of the Middle West, from Ohio on out, are magnificent. . . . The tourist trade has developed to an astounding degree along the well-traveled automobile roads. . . . A fact that stood out conspicuously on the trip was that rural modes of dress, as distinct from the urban, are passing in America. The automobile has brought this about. The young men and women of the smaller towns are no longer satisfied with the fashions of bygone years. If anything, they are ahead of their city cousins. . . . The privacy of rural life in this nation is gone forever. There is more traffic nowadays on the average rural road than there was fifteen or twenty years ago on a city street. . . . Stopping for Mass at various places en route, we found the clergy most hospitable, and every one of them had his eyes on Colorado. To the entire nation, this is a fairyland of romance. . . . Wonderful courtesy was shown by the traffic officers everywhere, because we were visitors. In New York City, while Catholics are far from having a monopoly of the police force, every single policeman we passed saluted us because we wore the Roman collar. . . . A trip of this kind gives ocular evidence of how strong the Catholic Church is in this country. Its magnificent institutions and its crossed-spires dot the landscape in every direction. . . . The huge parochial plants of many of the Eastern churches were surprising.

Father Smith evidently has not forgotten his early training as a reporter.